

THE
REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 2.—APRIL, 1886.

I.

GENERAL CHARACTER OF THE OLD TESTAMENT
REVISION.

BY PROF. F. A. GAST, D.D.

THE Bible is the one book of universal human interest. No other book has ever been so widely circulated or so frequently translated. With each new conquest of a nation by the Gospel the Scriptures are rendered into the language of that nation. And so, since the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament was made, two hundred years or more before the Christian era, versions have gone on multiplying, and they will continue to multiply, till every people under heaven shall read, in its own tongue, the blessed truths of God's inspired Word.

But every version, however excellent, will, in the course of time, require to be revised, not only on account of advancement in philological science and of progress in archæological, geographical and historical research, but also on account of the changes which, in the course of time, the language of the version inevitably undergoes. How many words have be-

come obsolete, how many have taken on new meanings since King James's Version was published in 1611!

It was felt, for a quarter of a century or more, that the time had arrived when a fresh revision of our English Bible could no longer be deferred; and, accordingly, in 1870, a committee, gathered not only from the Church of England, but from other churches of Britain and America as well, took the matter in hand. The result of their fourteen years' labor has now been given to the world. The Revised New Testament was published in May, 1881, and the Revised Old Testament in May, 1885.

We propose to give, in as simple and plain a manner as the subject will allow, some account of the general character of the Old Testament Revision. It may be well, in view of many misapprehensions in the popular mind, to state in definite terms just what is meant by the Old Testament Revision.

We remark that, taken as a whole, it is not a new English translation. Such a translation, made independently of earlier English translations and without regard to their diction and phraseology, would not meet the existing need. Two things are requisite if the work of the Revision Committee is not to prove a lamentable failure: first, accuracy of rendering, as far as that is attainable; and, secondly, due respect for the language of the Common Version, now almost grown sacred.

Every translation must be true to its original; otherwise it possesses no worth as a translation. It may have all the excellences of a finished literary work, its diction may be idiomatic and correct, rich and harmonious; yet, to the extent that it fails to reproduce the full meaning of the original, its value is diminished. This holds good, in a very special sense, of a translation of the Bible. Here we have to do with the Word of God; and what we need is that that Word, given to the world at first in Hebrew and Greek, be now given to us in English, so that the English reader, if an intelligent student, may gather from his Version the entire sense conveyed by the original texts, without loss, if possible, of a single shade of

meaning. That is, of course, an ideal which can never be perfectly realized. No translation can be an exact reflex of the original. The substance can be fully reproduced, but the forms in which it clothes itself, only partially. There will always be niceties of thought and feeling, felicities of expression, plays upon words, assonances and other features lending an added beauty and force, for which we can find no adequate equivalent. Still it is the duty of a translator of the Bible to strive after this ideal. Loyalty to the truth demands it. No sentimentality, no prejudice in favor of any other version. Nothing whatever may stand between us and whatsoever things were written "aforetime for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scripture might have hope." What we crave is the Word of truth, in its genuineness, its purity and its fulness, as God has communicated it to men for their instruction and guidance; and this we can have only by a faithful and accurate translation of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures in which it has pleased Him to disclose His will.

But the Church has, for hundreds of years, been reading the Bible in an English translation. The Version now in common use was published as early as 1611, and this was itself the outcome of a process extending over a period of more than eighty years. The work was begun by Tyndale, whose version of the New Testament was given to the world in 1525; it was carried forward in Coverdale's Bible, the Great Bible, the Geneva Bible, the Bishops' Bible; and it was finally completed in King James's Bible, which, if not ecclesiastically authorized, has yet been in general and popular use for no less than two centuries. In the main, the diction and phraseology of our English Bible are due to Tyndale, and the task of his successors consisted in revising and perfecting what he had begun.

Now, during this long period, the words of the English Bible have become household words. Constant use has made them familiar to all. For several centuries they have been read in the Church, the school, the family and the closet. Indeed, the Common Version has conferred a new dignity on

the English language and is even now regarded as its best standard. It has exerted an incalculable influence on English literature, which owes many of its peculiar excellences to conscious or unconscious imitation of its language and style. We may not wonder that its phraseology has become fixed in the memory and almost identified with the Word of God; and, under these circumstances, any change, even of single words, must necessarily have a somewhat disturbing and unpleasant effect: it jars harshly upon our feelings. Unquestionably, truth should not be sacrificed to sentiment or rhetorical beauty. In a translation of the Bible, truth should be secured at whatever cost. But every alteration not necessarily required by fidelity to the original Divine Word should be avoided, and the diction of the Older Version should be observed as far as possible.

And for this there are two important reasons. First, the English of our Common Version has never been equalled. The century, beginning about 1520, during which our English Bible gradually obtained its present beauty and finish, was precisely that in which our noble mother-tongue completed its process of development and attained its highest stage of perfection. "Since this period there has been, indeed, an enlargement of its stores, in order to keep pace with the progress of science, invention and art; but we witness no further process of organic growth. We see change, but no further amendment; rather a deterioration. This was the age of Hooker, Shakspeare and Bacon; of Spencer, Latimer and Raleigh, and it prepared the way for Hobbes and Dryden. It was the golden age of the English drama. These are great names, and many passages in their writings show a complete mastery of the English language, and form a grand display of its versatility, its sweetness and its strength. But, besides them all, and above them all, is the prose of our Common Version. It is more sustained than any of them; more uniformly strong and melodious in its flow, reminding one of the famous couplet of Denham on the Thames :

'Though deep, yet clear, though gentle, yet not dull,
Strong without rage; without o'erflowing full.'"¹

¹ A Layman's Study of the English Bible, pp. 10, 11.

Language of such matchless excellence, diction so simple and natural, yet so graceful and dignified, phraseology so strong and idiomatic, sentences so musical in their ring and so melodious in their flow, should not be altered except in fidelity to God's truth.

But, secondly, there is another and more important reason why the diction of the Common Version should be subjected to as little change as possible. Old and sacred associations should not be unnecessarily disturbed. It must not be forgotten that the Bible is the people's book. The scholar, who is able to read the original texts, makes his own translation even while he reads; but the people need to have the Scriptures given them in the language, not of the scholar, but of every day life. And never, perhaps, was a translation more successfully made in this regard than that which has been in use for nearly three centuries among the English-speaking nations. It was distinctly Tyndale's desire to make the Bible a people's book. "From first to last," says Westcott,¹ "his style and his interpretation are his own; and in the originality of Tyndale is included, in a large measure, the originality of our English Version. For not only did Tyndale contribute to it directly the substantial basis of half of the Old Testament (in all probability) and of the whole of the New, but he established a standard of Biblical translation which others followed. It is even of less moment that by far the greater part of his translation remains intact in our present Bible, than that his spirit animates the whole." The result has been that our Common, so-called Authorized, Version, which has so long and happily represented God's Word in the English language, has, as the inheritor of the excellences of all the preceding English versions, reigned supreme and without a successful rival for a period of several centuries. And during all this time it has exerted a profounder influence on the Anglo-Saxon mind and heart than any other book, whatever its beauty and power. Generation after generation has found in it spiritual life and refreshment. It has

¹ Westcott's *History of the English Bible*, p. 211.

instructed the ignorant, guided the perplexed and comforted the sorrowing. There is hardly an occasion in life with which its words are not associated in some form or other, whether of counsel or of warning, of encouragement or of reproof. Its language is stored up already in the mind of the child, and is never forgotten in after years. As Faber, after his conversion to Romanism, has beautifully said: "The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the griefs and trials of a man is hidden beneath its words; it is the representative of his best moments; and all that there has been about him of soft and gentle and pure and penitent and good speaks to him forever out of his English Bible." And so it has come to pass, through long religious use of this noble Version, that we cherish a sacred veneration for its very words. That sentiment deserves to be respected. It should, at least not be needlessly disturbed.

This was recognized by the Committee of Convocation, which laid down for the guidance of the Revisers, the following among other rules:

"1. To introduce as few alterations as possible into the Text of the Authorized Version consistently with faithfulness."

"2. To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the Authorized and earlier English Versions."

And the Revisers themselves in their Preface say: "In endeavoring to carry out as fully as possible the spirit of Rules 1 and 2, the Revisers have borne in mind that it was their duty not to make a new translation, but to revise one already existing, which for more than two centuries and a half had held the position of an English classic. They have therefore departed from it only in cases where they disagreed with the Translators of 1611 as to the meaning or construction of a word or sentence; or where it was necessary for the sake of uniformity to render such parallel passages as were identical in Hebrew by the same English words, so that an English reader might know at once by comparison that a difference in the

translation corresponded to a difference in the original; or where the language of the Authorized Version was liable to be misunderstood by reason of its being archaic or obscure; or, finally, where the rendering of an early English version seemed preferable, or where, by an apparently slight change it was possible to bring out more fully the meaning of a passage of which the translation was already substantially accurate."

How far have the Revisers succeeded in carrying out these principles? That is a question which will receive different answers according as stress is laid on one or other side of the double duty imposed on them. It was required, first, that they be faithful to the original text or give the exact English equivalent of the Hebrew Scriptures, and, secondly, that they be conservative, or, rather, preservative of the Authorized English text, so as not to give needless offense to the feelings of the people, to whom, through long usage and religious association, the Common Version has become very dear. Their task was a difficult one, and it exposed them to criticism on two sides: on the side of the Biblical scholar, by making too few changes, and on the side of the people, by making too many. In these circumstances, their work would necessarily partake of the nature of a compromise, and could not be generally satisfactory. They have succeeded in retaining the style, and to a large extent the vocabulary of the Old Version; even archaic forms that are still intelligible have not been cast out. They have removed many of the existing defects of the English Bible, and in innumerable places have given us improved renderings. Still, manifold inaccuracies have been allowed to stand. It is well known that the Authorized Version of the Old Testament is far inferior to that of the New, and yet the changes made by the Revisers of the Old Testament are proportionally only about one half as many as were made by the Revisers of the New. Many and important changes have been introduced, but not nearly as many as were required by faithfulness to the original text. In a word, the Revisers have been more just to the demands of conservatism than to the requirements of Hebrew scholarship.

What the Committee has given us, is professedly not a new independent translation, but simply a revision of an already existing translation. Nor is this revision based upon a revision of the Massoretic, or Received Hebrew text; though the fourth rule laid down for the guidance of the Revisers, whether of the Old Testament or of the New, is: "That the text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating; and that when the text so adopted differs from that from which the Authorized Version was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin." Nothing can be plainer than that this rule requires a revision, whenever revision is needed, of the Massoretic text, and not simply a revision of the English text. It imposes upon the Revisers the difficult and responsible task, not imposed upon King James's Translators of ascertaining, as far as possible, the true original Hebrew text, and, where various competing readings exist, of adopting "that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating." We fail to see how any intelligent mind can object to this rule. Nothing less than what it requires will satisfy the demands of truth. What we want is the Word of God in a faithful English translation; and that we do not get, if the text from which the translation is made is more or less corrupt. Hence the Committee of Convocation rightly laid it upon the Revisers as a duty to secure, if that be within the reach of possibility by careful investigation, the pure original text, and then, to reproduce that text, as precisely as may be, in an English translation.

The New Testament Company has observed this rule. It is universally admitted that the Greek text, on which the Authorized Version is based, possesses little authority. There are not less than 150,000 various readings; and, while the Revisers did not regard it as falling within their province to construct a continuous text, they did look upon a revision of the Greek text as the necessary foundation of their work. At least, they felt it obligatory upon them to decide between the various readings whenever they affected the translation.

But the Old Testament Company, on which this rule was

no less binding than on the New Testament Company, has left the Massoretic text almost wholly untouched. This will prove a source of general disappointment to scholars and make the Old Testament Revision of less value than that of the New Testament. For if the received Hebrew text needs to be emended (and it unquestionably does, as even the Revisers themselves concede), and if the task of removing its imperfections, at least, in part, be not, under present circumstances, impossible, then whatever the difficulties to be surmounted, the endeavor should have been faithfully made. A little has been done, but it is so little that either it should have been left undone, or much more should in consistency have been attempted. The general verdict on this part of the work will be: either too little or too much.

The Revisers state their position and give account of their treatment of the original text in their Preface, where they say: "The Received, or, as it is commonly called, the Massoretic Text of the Old Testament Scriptures, has come down to us in manuscripts, which are of no very great antiquity, and which all belong to the same family or recension. That other recensions were at one time in existence is probable from the variations in ancient versions, the oldest of which, namely, the Greek or Septuagint, was made, at least in part, some two centuries before the Christian era. But as the state of knowledge on the subject is not at present such as to justify any attempt at an entire reconstruction of the text on the authority of the Versions, the Revisers have thought it most prudent to adopt the Massoretic Text as the basis of their work, and to depart from it, as the Authorized Translators had done, only in exceptional cases. With regard to the variations in the Massoretic Text itself, the Revisers have endeavored to translate what appeared to them the best reading in the text, and where the alternative reading seemed sufficiently probable or important they have placed it in the margin. In some few instances of extreme difficulty a reading has been adopted on the authority of the Ancient Versions, and the departure from the Massoretic Text

recorded in the margin. In other cases, where the Versions appeared to supply a very probable though not so necessary a correction of the text, the text has been left and the variation indicated in the margin only."

As the Massoretic Text forms the basis of the Revisers' work, it is important to know just what that text is. We mean by it the present pointed Hebrew of the Old Testament Scriptures, as provided with vowel-signs, accents and other marks. It has come down to us, as the Revisers admit, "in manuscripts which are of no very great antiquity, and which all belong to the same family or recension." Indeed, the oldest manuscript of whose age we are certain is a manuscript of the Prophets, in the library of St. Petersburg, and that only dates from the year 916 A.D. The oldest manuscript of the whole Bible is in the Synagogue at Aleppo, and was written about 930 A.D. There are manuscripts, it is true, for which an earlier date is claimed—one in Cairo, ascribed to the year 895, and another in Cambridge, to the year 856; but these claims are very doubtful and not generally acknowledged. The most valuable manuscripts of the Old Testament, and notably the *Codex Hilleli*, vaguely assigned to about the year 600 A.D., are irrecoverably lost; and, accordingly, we have no manuscript authority for the Hebrew text which goes beyond the tenth century of the Christian era.

Indeed, we have as yet no critical edition even of the Massoretic text. The *textus receptus*, as found in our printed Hebrew Bibles, is based upon the text in the second edition of Bomberg's Rabbinic Bible, in four volumes folio, printed in Venice, 1525-26, and edited by the Jewish scholar Jacob Ben Chayyim, who took as his groundwork the text of the first edition, but emended it from data derived from manuscripts, and particularly from the Massorah, that is, the collection of critical and grammatical notes which, partly transmitted by oral tradition from an earlier age, were fixed in writing and carried forward to completion, between the sixth and eleventh centuries, by the so-called Massorites. The Massoretic authorities, however, were not in complete agreement. There were

two schools among them,—the Babylonian, whose model was the Codex Ben Naphtali, and the Palestinian, represented by the Codex Ben Asher, both codices dating probably from the first half of the ninth century. These great Massoretic standard-copies have perished, but numerous variations between Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali, between the Western and the Eastern Jews, have been handed down. They are now being gathered together and critically examined by scholars, who, like Ginsburg and Freundsorff, have devoted themselves to the task of collecting the entire Massorah, and, on the basis of it, restoring the full and pure Massoretic text.

But the Massoretic text, even if it were critically established, would not present the text of the Old Testament Scriptures in the form in which it came from the hand of the inspired authors. The original text, as written by the Hebrew historians, prophets and poets, underwent manifold changes and received numerous additions before it acquired the shape in which it has come down to us. It passed through a history extending over many centuries, during which learned Jewish scribes gradually settled it in its present form, and finally authorized it as the only correct text. It is necessary to glance for a moment at this history that we may have a right conception of the character of the Massoretic text.¹

The Old Testament was originally written on skins, probably also on papyrus, in the antique form of rolls. The character employed was different from that found in Hebrew manuscript, and printed Bibles. It was the Archaic Hebrew, nearly identical with the character seen on the Moabite stone. After the Exile (though at what precise date is not known) it was exchanged for some form of the Aramaic, which gradually developed into our present square characters. The Hebrew text of the translators was almost certainly in Aramaic writing, and the only question is, whether it approximated most nearly to the Palmyrene, the Nabathæan or the Egyptian Aramaic.

¹ See Dillmann's Art. *Bibeltext des Alten Testaments* in Herzog's Real Encyclopädie.

But whatever the exact form of the letters, they were at first written continuously without being separated into distinct words. On the Moabite, as well as on the Siloam inscriptions, the words are divided by dots ; but that this was not the universal practice is evident from the different division of words often found in the Septuagint and other early texts. And whilst, in poetry, verses and their parts were from the beginning marked off by separate lines and intervals, it is probable that, in prose, sentences were not indicated, or at least only in special cases.

The text through all the early period of its history was unpointed. It had no signs for vowels, no reading-marks of any kind ; it consisted of bare consonants. Such a text must occasionally have been uncertain, even when the language was a living one, and at an early time already a need must have been felt of indicating at least the long vowels. For this purpose the consonants ף, ם, ן, rarely ך, came gradually into use as vowel-letters. Originally, however, internal vowels were not indicated in the Biblical text, as they are not on the Moabite and Siloam inscriptions. It would, indeed, be a mistake to say with Lagarde that the Hebrew manuscripts of the Septuagint translators had no vowel-letters, but a comparison of the Massoretic text with the Septuagint makes it certain that their use was comparatively rare. Their absence is implied in numberless cases by the reading of the Septuagint as well as of the other early versions.

The vowel-points are of much later origin. They were not attached to the text from which the Septuagint Version was made, as is evident both from the frequent confounding of words which consist of the same consonants, and from the spelling of proper names, the vocalization of which is often so different from that in our Massoretic text. Jewish coins, Phœnician inscriptions, and even the Synagogue-rolls are never pointed. Indeed, as late as the time of Jerome and the Talmud, at the close of the fifth century after Christ, the vowel-signs and accents had not been invented. They were first introduced into the Biblical text in the seventh and eighth centuries.

Now, it needs but little consideration to see how easily mistakes might creep into the Old Testament in the course of its changes from a purely consonantal text continuously written in an archaic character, to the form in which it has been transmitted to us. Whatever the conscientiousness of its copyists and punctuators, only a miracle (which we have no right to suppose,) could have kept it absolutely free from corruptions. All except the original consonantal text is the work of uninspired men, who, by the division of the text into words and sentences, by the insertion of vowel-letters, and by the attachment of vowel signs, accents and other reading-marks, have given us their understanding of the Old Testament, not necessarily the meaning of the sacred writers.

An unpointed text will often be more or less ambiguous. The same group of consonants, if standing alone, may often be read in six, eight, or even more different ways, each of which will give a different sense, though, in general, the context will determine the exact reading. Still, cases do arise where there is room for doubt. Thus, in Is. liv. 13: "And all thy children *shall be* taught of the Lord; and great *shall be* the peace of thy children," it was a question according to the Talmud, whether לְבָנַי should be pointed בְּנֵי (bānaik), *thy children*, or בְּנֵי (bōnaik), *thy builders*. Amid such uncertainty, even though it be only occasional, what guarantee have we that the Massorites have never set the wrong points? At all events, the Septuagint and other early versions in numberless instances read the same consonants differently from the Massoretic punctuators. Where, for instance, in Is. ix. 7, the Hebrew reads: "The Lord sent a word into Jacob," the Greek and Arabic versions have: "The Lord sent death into Jacob;" the consonants being pointed in the one case לִדְבַר, *word*, and in the other לְמָוֶת, *pestilence*. Doubtless, the Massorites rested on good oral tradition; but who will affirm that that tradition was infallible? Unquestionably their text is in all respects the best that has come down to us; but it would be too much to say that it is immaculate. And if by changing the punctuation—the work

of uninspired men—we can obtain a better sense and one more consonant with the context, what is to restrain us, but a Jewish tradition? Certainly where the ancient versions, and especially the Septuagint, while having the same consonants as the Massoretic text, supply different vowels, we should at least pause to consider, whether they have not the true reading. In many cases it will be found that they have.

What is true of the vowel-signs and accents—that they are of the nature of interpretation, is true, also, of the vowel-letters. The insertion of a ¹ may fix a certain reading to the exclusion of another that is possible in the absence of the ¹. Thus in Hos. viii. 14, our Received Text has: “they rebel against me, סִרִּי בִי,” while the Septuagint has: “they are chastised by me.” The consonantal text was the same, סִרִּי, which the Greek translator read סִרִּי, and the Massorites סִרִּי, a difference of reading which would have been impossible if the internal vowel had been indicated. Many of the differences between our Massoretic text and the text of the early version are to be explained by the fact that originally internal vowels were not indicated, even where, according to our ideas, such indication was to be expected, as in the *Ayin Vau* verb. It admits of no doubt, indeed, that in general the vowel-letters are rightly placed; but inasmuch as they are an addition to the original text and may make a false reading, it becomes necessary to scan them with care.

And so, too, as regards the division of the consonantal text into words and sentences, the Septuagint, Vulgate and other early versions often vary from the division found in the Massoretic text, and thus give us widely different readings. For example, in Ps. iv. 3, (2 A. V. :), the Hebrew reads: “O ye sons of men, how long shall my glory be turned into dishonor, how long will ye love vanity?” But the Septuagint and other versions translate: “How long will ye be heavy-hearted, wherefore love ye vanity?” Instead of כְּבוֹדִי לִכְלִמָּה, they read; כְּבוֹדִי רַב לִמָּה. The first word lacked the vowel-letter ¹, the second word was divided into two, and the כ was mistaken for ב.

Sometimes, as in this case, one Hebrew word is split into two by the Septuagint; at other times the Septuagint reads as one word what makes two in the present Hebrew text, as 1 Chron. xvii. 10; and still again, the Greek translators transfer a letter from the end of one word to the beginning of the next, as in Hos. vi. 5: "and thy judgments *are as* the light *that* goeth forth," וְכִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ אֹרֶךְ יָצָא, where, as is noticed in the margin of the Revision, the Septuagint has: "and my judgment goeth forth as the light," וְכִשְׁפָּטִי כְאֹרֶךְ, which is probably correct. It is apparent from these and many other instances which might be given, that the Hebrew text was originally written without intervals between the words, and that the present final letters were not in use when the Greek Version was made. It is possible, accordingly, that the Massoretic division into words and sentences may occasionally be erroneous.

But even the *Kethibh*, or unpointed written consonantal text, may not be wholly exempt from corruption. Nothing is more common than mistakes in transcription. They may be due to misreading, mishearing, mental confusion, faults of the memory and misunderstanding. They are, of course, unintentional; for we have no reason to think that the Jews at any time deliberately altered their Scriptures for an evil purpose. But however careful the transcriber might be, errors were liable to creep into his copy through omissions, insertions and transpositions. Indeed, the Hebrew text was peculiarly liable to corruption in the process of transcription, on account of the similarity of many of its letters. ם and ן and ך and ך, to mention no others, are so nearly alike as to be interchanged. It is evident that, in these circumstances, false readings would find place in different manuscripts, and that some of these may have been perpetuated in our Massoretic text.

It is a popular notion that the Jews exercised a sacred guardianship over their Scriptures. And this is true of the post-Massoretic age. When once the Biblical text was perfectly vocalized and accented, and the distinction of *Qeri*, or marginal reading, and *Kethibh*, or written consonantal text, was firmly

established, the labors of the Massorites were ended. Nothing remained but to watch over the text and guard it against corruption. And, accordingly, from the eleventh century onward, the variations in our manuscripts, which nearly all date from this time, are of the most unimportant character, and only concern vowel-letters, vowel-signs, and accents.

But it is not true that in the pre-Massoretic age, the text was perfectly uniform. Centuries were required to bring the consonantal text into its present shape. It is evident that in the period before the collection of the Canon the manuscripts diverged widely. Without a miracle it could not have been otherwise; made by different hands, at different times and places, the mistakes of copyists would unavoidably arise. At a time when, as in the pre-Canonic age, the Scriptures were not regarded as holy in the later sense, transcribers would naturally take less care; and as there was no standard edition by which to correct their copies, their errors would be the more easily perpetrated. We have, of course, no external testimony as to the state of the text before the time of Ezra; but we may, with absolute certainty, infer the existence of variants from phenomena that lie on the surface of the Old Testament Scriptures. Let any one compare, in the original, the broad deviations of the parallel passages, such as Ps. xiv and Ps. xviii and 2 Sam. xxii; Jer. lii. and 2 Kg. xxiv, and he will at once see with what freedom later authors recast earlier writings, not caring to preserve exactly each word and letter. But where such freedom was exercised, corruptions of the text were sure to occur.

As soon, however, as the Scriptures came to be collected and employed in public worship, as the rule of faith and life, attention would be turned to these variations of the manuscripts, and a need be felt of fixing the text. This work was begun by Ezra, but was not completed until centuries later. That the text was not uniform in the most wide-spread and approved manuscripts before the second century B. C., is evident from the Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch and the Septuagint version. We may freely admit that these early texts are far

inferior in value to the Massoretic text ; but it is impossible to believe that their various readings are all due to accidental or arbitrary alterations of the sacred writings. They must have had before them a Hebrew text differing widely from our Received Hebrew text. And as in more than a thousand places, the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch agree, where they differ from the Massoretic text, we can only infer that those readings, whether bad or good, were at that time the most usual, and were only set aside at a later period in the more accurate elaboration of the text by the Palestinian Scribes. As we advance into the Christian age we find the text more firmly established and the divergence of the versions growing constantly less. The Greek versions of Aquila and Theodotion, in the second century of our era, differ much less widely from our Massoretic text than the Septuagint does ; the Targums dating in their written form from the third and fourth centuries, the Hebrew texts of Origen's Hexapla and of Jerome differ still less ; while in the Talmud, toward the close of the fifth century, the consonantal text appears as fully and finally settled.

We cannot be too thankful to the early Jewish Scribes for the labor they bestowed upon the establishment of the text. Of their conscientiousness, their almost superstitious care, there can be no manner of doubt. They have faithfully preserved the peculiarities of individual authors, books and ages. They have retained archaisms, dialectic differences and characteristics of style. They have incorporated different recensions of the same pieces. They have carefully reproduced undoubted discrepancies. They have given every indication of having engaged in the work with scrupulous fidelity. For this they cannot receive too great credit. But in criticism, conscientiousness and care are not enough. There must be correct critical principles and a right appreciation of them. How, then, did the Scribes proceed in fixing the present text ? Not, it appears, polemically, or apologetically, or even, to any great extent, conjecturally, but by a comparison of manuscripts. We know from the Talmud that in the age of the Scribes various

readings existed, and that these were compared, and the preference given to that which had the largest number of manuscripts in its favor. Everything, however, depends on the quality, not on the number, of the manuscripts. And it is probable that errors have been perpetuated because, occurring in a majority of the manuscripts compared, they were accordingly incorporated in the text.

The existence of errors and the necessity of emendation is acknowledged by the Massorites themselves in the *Qeris*, or marginal readings which were to be substituted for the *Kethibhs*, or the readings in the written text. Where for any reason it was desirable that a word in the text should be omitted, it was left unpointed, and a small circle above it referred to the marginal note: *written, but not read*. When, on the other hand, one or more words not in the text should be inserted a space was left filled only with vowel-points, and above them the small circle referring to the margin, where the word or words are given with the remark: *read, but not written*. And again, where for some grammatical or euphemistic reason, a word in the text should be replaced by another, the small circle above it referred to the margin where the word to be substituted was placed with the note: *read*. Now, these *Qeris*, of which more than two thousand are given by the larger Massorah, and some of which were known already to the writers of the Talmud, are a clear proof that the Rabbis detected what they at least supposed to be textual errors, and that they attempted to correct them.

A second class of emendations consist of what are known as *the extraordinary points*, which belong, at least in part, to the pre-Talmudic age. They are dots which in fifteen instances (ten in the Pentateuch, four in the Prophets, and one in the Psalter) are placed over certain letters and words, to indicate that for some reason the letters and words so marked were called in question and ought perhaps to be erased.

In the case of both the *Qeris* and of *the extraordinary points* the text was left untouched, for which the Scribes deserve our highest thanks. But there is a third class of emendations

which, according to the Talmud and the Massorah, effected alterations in the text itself. These are known as the *Ittur Sopherim*, or removal by the Scribes, in five places of the letter י; and the *Tiqqun Sopherim*, or correction of the Scribes, the object of which was the removal of what seemed objectionable, inappropriate, or unfitting modes of expression. These latter are of great significance, as indicating the critical principles of those Jewish scholars who settled our present Hebrew text. There are eighteen instances in all, sixteen of which are given by the Massorah, with a notice of the reading which the Scribes displaced. From an examination of these, it is considered probable by scholars that the earlier reading was in some cases at least the original one, which the Scribes, because of something offensive or doubtful, felt justified in altering. Thus Gen. xviii. 22: "Abraham stood yet before the Lord" is a correction for: "The Lord stood yet before Abraham;" and this latter is probably the original reading, inasmuch as it is better suited to the context.

This somewhat lengthy digression seemed to us necessary to show such readers as may be unacquainted with the history of the Old Testament text how, with all care on the part of those who gave the text its present form, errors were likely to arise in the course of the changes and additions it underwent in the lapse of centuries. Our Massoretic text is beyond all question vastly superior to any other that has been transmitted to us. This is only what might have been expected from the conscientious labor bestowed upon it by the Palestinian Scribes. But it is by no means faultless. Some books show more corruption than others, but in all perhaps there will be found blemishes which it is the task of criticism to remove. In this opinion all scholars to-day are agreed. Dr. Dillmann, one of the best Old Testament critics, expresses the view now almost universally entertained by scholars, when he says: "With the most accurate restoration of the Massoretic text, there is given indeed, the necessary foundation for all further textual criticisms, but not yet the perfectly correct text itself. Outside of this officially established Mas-

soretic text, many more original and better readings have been preserved in the ancient versions, and also, though rarely, in Hebrew manuscripts. Nor can we always approve the Massoretic punctuation as corresponding to the text, and besides all, some errors are involved in the text itself, which come from the most ancient times to which no critical monument any longer extends. To attain to constantly greater certainty in the purification of the text from such faults, is the aim of criticism, which therefore, in case of necessity, cannot despise even conjectures; and a knowledge of the history of the text must show that such criticism is not only a right, but also a duty of the exegete towards his text."¹

The Revisers of the Old Testament have practically conceded the truth of this statement; for whilst they "have thought it most prudent to adopt the Massoretic text as the basis of their work," they have not hesitated to make here and there what they supposed to be necessary changes. By their procedure they have admitted this much at least—that the Massoretic text may, at various points, be improved. Let us glance briefly at their textual emendations.

They have, at different places, altered the Massoretic text, sometimes on external evidence, sometimes on internal. They have made insertions, as, for instance, Josh. xxi. 36, 37. These verses, although in our Authorized Version, are not found in our printed Hebrew Bibles. Both verses are supported by the majority of manuscripts and are found in the early versions. They were wrongly dropped by Jacob Ben Chayyim, in his Rabbinic Bible of 1525, on the authority of the Massorah.

Again, 2 Sam. viii. 18, they rightly insert the preposition *ל*, "*over*," as was done by the Authorized Version, and omit the *ו* which was retained by King James's translators, and rendered "*both*."

In 1 Chron. vi. 28 (Heb. 13), after "the first-born" they

¹(Real-Encyklopädie, Art. *Bibletext des Alten Testament*, Bd. II. pp. 399-400.)

insert the name "Joel," which is not in the Authorized Version, and must have fallen out of the text, as is evident from 1 Sam. viii. 2.

In Ps. xxiv. 6, they insert, in accordance with the Septuagint and the Syriac, the words "O God of" before "Jacob," an emendment not found in the Authorized Version. In one instance, Jud. xviii. 30, they have omitted a suspended *nun*, and so read "Moses" in the text, instead of the "Manasseh" of the Authorized Version, which now stands in the margin. It is true that both the Talmud and the Midrash admit that the person referred to was the grandson of Moses, but all the versions except the Vulgate adopt the reading of the suspended *nun*.

In several places they have substituted another word for that in the text. In Jud. xx. 10, *Gibeah* takes the place of *Geba*. In 1 Sam. vi. 18, the Authorized Version has, "the great stone of Abel," inserting the words "stone of," which are not in the Hebrew text; but the Revisers, by changing the ל into נ read with the Septuagint and the Targum אבן, "stone," instead of the meaningless אבל, "Abel," which is now transferred to the margin and translated "a meadow." This emendation is good, and it is only a pity that the Revisers, while they were about it, did not make the further emendations required in the last part of this verse.

In 1 Sam. xxvii. 10, the Hebrew reads, אֶל פֶּשֶׁתָּם, where אֶל can hardly be taken as the particle of subjective negation. If, as is very probable, there is a textual error, we may emend in two ways: we may either assume that the interrogative pronoun מִי, has fallen out, and then, reading אֶל מִי, or, better, אֵל, translate with the Septuagint and the Vulgate, "against whom have ye made a raid"; or we may, with the Targum, the Peshitto and the Arabic, read מָן, "whither," instead of אֶל, and translate, as both the Authorized and the Revised Versions do, "whither have ye made a raid."

In 2 Sam. xviii. 3, עַתָּה, "now," is changed to אַתָּה, "thou." 1 Kg. vii. 18, רִפְּנִים, "pomegranates" is changed to עֲמִיזִים, "pil-

lars." And so in 1 Chron. xxv. 23, the Revisers, correcting פִּינָה to פֶּנֶה, "corner," read "unto the corner gate," instead of "the gate that looketh."

In 1 Chron. xxiv. 6, they give us a purely conjectural emendation. The word אָחִי, "taken," is repeated in the Hebrew text, which, as the margin says, has "taken, taken for Ithamar." It is the reading of all Hebrew manuscripts, except a few late unimportant ones. The ancient translators and the Rabbis did not understand the passage, nor, indeed, will it yield an intelligent meaning, till with the Revisers we change the first אָחִי to אֶחָד, "one," and translate, "one taken for Ithamar."

Sometimes the correction affects a grammatical form. Thus Ruth iv. 4, יִגְאֹל, "he will redeem," is corrected to תִּגְאֹל, "thou wilt redeem." In 1 Sam. ii. 21, יִפְקֹד is corrected to יִפְקֹדֶיךָ. In Ps. xvi. 2, the second person feminine אָמַרְתְּ, "thou hast said," is changed by the English, though not by the American Revisers, to אָמַרְתִּי, "I have said." In Ps. lix. 10, עָז, "his strength," is changed to עָזִי, "my strength" by the English Revisers, the Americans here again regarding the change as unnecessary.

Most of these textual changes are comparatively insignificant, but in Ps. xxii. 16, there is one which is of great importance and has given rise to much discussion. The Massoretic text has נִצַּר, which, as the margin states, signifies "as a lion." And this is the reading of almost all the Hebrew manuscripts that have come down to us. Instead of this, however, the ancient versions all read a finite verb, which is translated "they pierced" by the Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Peshitto, "they bound" by Symmachus and Jerome, and "they put to shame" by Aquila in the first edition of his work. The Revisers, setting aside the Massoretic interpretation, read instead of נִצַּר, "like a lion," נִצְּרוּ, "they pierced."

These, we believe, are all the changes made by the Revisers in the text itself. Most of them are judicious and will be accepted as necessary. They are, however, but a small part of what the Biblical scholar, accustomed to compare the Massoretic

text with the early versions, had just reason to expect. It is surprising that, having made these few changes, the Revisers did not feel themselves constrained to make many more.

In various places, indeed, they adopt the *Qeri* in preference to *Kethibh*. Thus in Ps. xvi. 10, instead of the plural as read in the Hebrew text יְיָ אֱהוּבִים , "thy beloved ones," the Revisers read the singular, according to the *Qeri*, יְיָ אֱהוּבִי , "thy holy one," or, better, "thy beloved one." The Massorah mentions fifteen places where לֵּי , "to him," should be read for לֹא , "not." In some of these instances the Revisers retain the *Kethibh*, as, for example, in Job vi. 21; though generally they adopt the *Qeri*, without, however, always indicating the fact in the margin; as, for example, Lev. xi. 21; but they nowhere tell us by what principle they were guided in their retention or rejection of the *Kethibh*.

The main results, however, and often the best, of the Revisers' work upon the text, are not incorporated into the text itself, but are hidden away in the margin, where they will prove of little service to the generality of Bible readers. In fact, the margin contains between three and four hundred corrections, of which more than two hundred affect the meaning to a greater or less extent.

Sometimes, while the text retains the *Kethibh*, the margin gives the *Qeri*. Thus, 1 Kg. ix. 18, we read Tamar in the text, but Tadmor in the margin. Tadmor is the reading of 2 Chron. viii. 4, of many Hebrew manuscripts and of all the versions except the Septuagint, and even the Septuagint reading implies the presence of the ד in the text from which the translation was made. It was adopted by the Authorized Version, but is placed in the margin by the Revisers. To mention only one other instance: in 2 Kg. xx. 4, the Authorized Version, following the *Qeri*, reads, "into the middle court," while the Revisers, returning to the *Kethibh*, translate, "into the middle part of the city," and place the *Qeri* in the margin, in spite of the fact that it is the reading of all the ancient versions and is adopted by such able critics as Thenius and Ewald.

And here we may remark that the Revisers are guilty of great inconsistency in dealing with the *Qeri*s. Of the two thousand or more given in the Massorah, while not less than two-thirds relate to insignificant matters, such as the full or defective writing of certain words, the remaining third are of importance, since they make more or less difference in the sense. Yet of these important readings the Revisers have ignored more than one half. Occasionally they adopt the *Qeri*, but give no note to that effect in the margin; and the unlearned reader would never suspect that the *Kethibh* contains another, and, perhaps, better reading. Thus in Gen. xxiv. 33, the *Kethibh* is וַיִּשֶׁת, "and one set," while the *Qeri* is וַיִּשֶׁב, "and there was set." Both the Authorized and the Revised Versions adopt the *Qeri*, but the margin gives no hint of the existence of another reading.

Another class of marginal notes relating to the original text consists of those in which the Revisers state that the text is "probably correct," "faulty" or "obscure," but without any attempt at emendation. There are perhaps nine or ten instances in all. Thus where in 2 Sam. xxiii. 8, the Authorized Version reads, "the Tachmonite that sat in the seat," the Revised Version reads, "Josheb-Basshebeth a Tachmonite," the reading which the Authorized Version gives in the margin. There is here a palpable corruption, as stated in the margin of the revision. Various corrections have been proposed, but none of them could have proved satisfactory to two-thirds of the revisers. Other instances are: 2 Chron. xxxiv. 6; Neh. iv. 23; Prov. vii. 22; Isa. lxiv. 5; Jer. xi. 15; Am. iv. 3; Zech. xiv. 18. In one case, where a numeral has certainly fallen out of the Massoretic text, the Revisers supply it, though in brackets, from a late recension of the Septuagint. It is found at I. Sam. xiii. 1, where the Hebrew text has, "Saul was a year old when he began to reign; and he reigned two years over Israel." The corruption is manifest, but how to remove it is the question. The verse is omitted from the true Septuagint text, either because it was not found in the manuscripts

employed by the Seventy, or because they did not understand it. Two numerals have fallen out, which can only be conjecturally restored, and which it is better, therefore, to leave blank, thus: "Saul was——years old when he began to reign, and he reigned——years over Israel." Instead of this, however, the Revision reads: "Saul was (*thirty*) years old when he began to reign, and he reigned two years over Israel." This is unfortunate; for, according to this emendation, Saul was only thirty-two years old when he died, and yet he left a son behind him forty years old. (See 2 Sam. ii. 10.)

The largest and most important class of marginal notes relating to the text consists of various readings derived from the ancient versions. They number in all about 225 or 230. It is impossible, of course, to examine them now in detail; we only remark, in a general way, *first*, that, according to the Revisers' own principles, some of these variants should have been removed from the margin to the text. They tell us that "in some few instances of extreme difficulty a reading has been adopted on the authority of the Ancient Versions, and the departure from the Massoretic text recorded in the margin. In other cases, where the versions appeared to supply a very probable though not so necessary a correction of the text, the text has been left and the variation indicated in the margin only." Now, if in any instance, (and there are many such according to the Revisers' own confession), such a marginal reading is "a very probable," even though not an absolutely "necessary correction of the text," it would seem that the evidence in its favor must be "decidedly preponderating," and, according to Rule IV., the text to be adopted is that "for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating." Take but a single instance, Gen. iv. 8. Here, as the Revisers inform us in the margin, the Hebrew reads: "And Cain said unto Abel his brother." What he said is not in the Massoretic text. It is, however, in the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Septuagint, the Itala, the Vulgate, the Peshitto and the Targum of Jerusalem, which read: "And Cain said to Abel his brother, Let us go

into the field." And this is doubtless the original text, having both the external and internal evidence in its favor, and absolutely nothing but the Massoretic text against it.

We remark again, that not everything deserving of consideration has been inserted in the margin. For example, while the Revisers say that the word "Ammonites" in 2 Chron. xx. 1, is perhaps an error for "Meunim," as given by the Septuagint in the very next verse, they take no notice whatever of a still more necessary emendation. For here כַּאֲרִים, "from Syria" must undoubtedly be read כְּאֶדֶם, "from Edom." The correction is found in manuscripts, and is implied in the Syriac and Arabic versions, which have, "from the remote region of the Red Sea." Besides, it is not only required by v. 10, but the text as it stands would involve the geographical absurdity that a great multitude from Syria had come against Jehoshaphat "from beyond the sea." We call attention only to one other omission from the margin. The Hebrew text, Ex. xii. 40, states that the sojourn of the children of Israel in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years. This does not agree with other historical notices in the Old Testament, or with the account by St. Stephen in Acts vii. 6, and the reference of St. Paul in Gal. iii. 17. At all events, in the time of our Lord, the Jews had a different reading of the text. The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint read: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel (Sam. and Alex. "and of their fathers") which they sojourned in Egypt and in the Land of Canaan (in the Samaritan this order is reversed) was four hundred and thirty years." To us, it seems, that the Massoretic Text has the original reading, but the variation, which is noticed by all commentators, is so important that it should have found a place in the Revisers' margin.

It will be seen, from what has been said, that the Massoretic text has been left almost wholly unchanged. The most that has been done in the way of revision is buried in the margin; and even against this the American Company has entered a protest. They say in their Appendix, No. VI: "Omit from

the margin all renderings from the LXX., Vulgate, and other ancient versions and authorities."

It must be admitted that the margin is an evil. As a *critical apparatus* it is of no benefit to those who are acquainted with Old Testament criticism, for the information it supplies is neither new nor complete; and as for the general reader, he will either not suffer his attention to be diverted to it from the text, or, if he does, his mind will only be distracted by what he finds. And yet in this case, the margin, though an evil, was doubtless a necessary one. The reading "for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating," should be placed in the text. But when is the evidence "decidedly preponderating?" That question would be differently answered by individual members of a large Committee, entertaining divergent opinions as to the purity of the text, guided by conflicting critical principles, and governed, as in this instance, by a two-thirds rule. A particular reading might secure the votes of a majority, and yet fail to secure the votes of two-thirds of the Committee. Nothing would remain but to admit such a reading (and it might be the true, original one) into the margin, where it is of no benefit to readers ignorant of criticism, since they have not the means of testing what seems offered only as a suggestion, nor yet any knowledge of the arguments by which either one or the other reading may be supported or controverted.

And thus, while the Biblical scholar has just reason to be disappointed that these fourteen years of work have done so little for the purification of the Massoretic text, he may not be altogether surprised. When we consider the difficulty, magnitude and delicacy of the task, how little has been done as yet for the textual criticism of the Old Testament and what a lack of agreement exists among Old Testament scholars; when we consider that our manuscripts are of late date and of a single recension, and that, in consequence, we are dependent on the early versions and, to some extent, on conjecture; when we consider the wretched state of the text of the early versions

and the perils attendant on mere conjecture; when, finally, we consider the constitution of the Committee, composed as it was of many minds differing in their ways of looking at the subject, as well as in their learning, training and diligence—we cannot wonder much at the small results. In these circumstances it would be unreasonable to expect of the Revisers an entire reconstruction of the text; but it does seem that they ought to have done more, much more than they have actually done. The Revision is not a Revision of the Massoretic but of the Authorized English text, and here happily the work is, in the main, worthy of high praise.

The Authorized Version is itself a revision. According to the instruction given to King James's translators, the ordinary Bible read in the Church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, was to be followed, and as little altered as the truth of the original would permit; and the admirable Preface, written by Dr. Miles Smith, says: "Truly, good Christian reader, we never thought from the beginning that we should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one; but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark."

Excellent, however, as the Authorized Version is, it had hardly come into general use before the need of still further revision made itself felt. Nor will this seem surprising when we remember the meagre critical apparatus at the command of the translators. This embraced the Hebrew Bible, with the interlinear Latin translation of Montanus in the Antwerp Polyglot, and the original Latin translation by Tremellius; the Septuagint and the Vulgate in such editions as were then in circulation; and the Targum of Onkelos. The Samaritan Pentateuch and the versions in Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic and Persian were not yet known. The only philological helps were Buxtorf's Lexicon and his Hebrew Grammar. It is nothing strange that a translation, made in such disadvantageous circumstances, even though by the ablest scholars of the day, should have its imperfections and blemishes, necessitating a fresh

revision. A demand for such a revision was long since made by such scholars as Lightfoot, Brett and Lowth; and about thirty years ago it was renewed and earnestly pressed by such learned, yet conservative men, as Trench and Ellicott, the latter of whom forcibly says: "It is in vain to cheat our own soul with the thought that these errors (in the Authorized Version) are either insignificant or imaginary. There *are* errors, there *are* inaccuracies, there *are* misconceptions, there *are* obscurities. And that man who, after being in any degree satisfied of this, permits himself to lean to the counsels of a limited or popular obstructiveness, or who, intellectually unable to test the truth of these allegations, nevertheless permits himself to denounce or deny them, will have to sustain the tremendous charge of having dealt deceitfully with the inviolable Word of God."¹

Since the Revision of 1611, new manuscripts have been brought to light, and among them, the oldest manuscript of the Old Testament whose date is certainly known — the celebrated *Codex Petropolitanus*, 916 A.D., and other early versions have come to the knowledge of Western scholars; great advances along newly broken paths have been made in Semetic philology; the Assyrian language, closely allied to the Hebrew and throwing unexpected light on rarely occurring words in the Old Testament, has been rescued from oblivion; and research in the field of Biblical geography, Archæology, and history has made marvelous progress. It is not, therefore, surprising that, for a quarter of a century or more, there has been a growing desire not only on the part of Biblical scholars, but also on the part of the Christian Church in general, to employ these fresh materials in an attempt to revise the English Bible and bring it into the form demanded by the scholarship of the age. The attempt has at length been made, and after fourteen years of arduous labor has been brought to a conclusion.

Our space will not admit of a detailed examination of this part of the Revisers' work. We must necessarily confine ourselves to a general characterization.

¹ (*Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. Preface.)

The external form of the Old Testament will be found to be much improved. The old division into chapters and verses interferes very materially with the proper understanding, as it constantly makes breaks in what is logically connected; and while this old division is retained on the margin for the sake of comparison, a new rational division, into paragraphs, based on the logical meaning, is introduced into the text. The division of the paragraphs may not always be correct, but, in general, it will commend itself, and it will certainly prove a great advantage to the reader.

So, again, the poetic books of Job (except the prologue and epilogue, which are prose), the Psalms, the Proverbs, Solomon's Song and the Lamentations assume the outward form of poetry according to the laws of Hebrew parallelism. This recognition of the poetic structure should in consistency have been extended to the prophets also; for the discourses of all of them, except Daniel, have the form of poetry, often, as in Isaiah, of the highest sublimity. The lyric songs scattered throughout the historical books are arranged in poetic lines though not always rightly divided, but those in the prophetic books, except the prayer of Jonah and the psalm of Habakkuk, are printed as if they were prose. The reason for this, if there is a reason, is hard to understand.

When we pass from the outward form of the text to the text itself, we cannot fail to observe that it is clearer to the modern reader and more conformable to the original Hebrew.

Various archaisms have been removed. During the period that has elapsed since the Authorized Version was published quite a number of words employed in that version have become obsolete, and are now generally unintelligible, or at least misleading; such as *artillery*=bows and arrows, *carriage*=baggage, *champaign*=plain, *ear*=plow, *tache*=clasp, *ouches*=settings, *chapiter*=capital, *road*=raid, and many others. Some of these expressions may be obsolete in one country, and in familiar use in another. This fact created a difficulty for the Revisers. Thus the Scotch plead for the retention of *leasing*—falsehood, which, twice found in our Common Version, is still used in Scotland,

and it was only on account of the earnest protest of the American Company that it was cast out in the final revision. The Revisers, however, in dealing with these archaisms, have not always been consistent. The word *prevent*=come before, occurs fifteen times. In nine cases it has been changed, but in the remaining six, in spite of the recommendation of the American Company, it has been retained, although it is certain to be misunderstood by the unlearned reader. The process of purification has evidently not been carried far enough, but we are thankful that what has been done adds much to a better understanding of the English Bible.

Certain changes have been made for the sake of euphony. A number of words which have become offensive on account of their associations have been replaced by others. It would be wrong, of course, to yield to a silly prudery; still there are expressions in the Authorized Version which we naturally shrink from reading in public. "Harlot" has not as unpleasant a sound to polite ears as "whore," though the signification is the same. In the phrase "to play the whore" it has been uniformly substituted, but the phrase "to go a whoring" has been retained. At the urgent desire of the American Company, and with the reluctant concurrence of the English, that most offensive expression of all, found in I. Saml. xxv. 22 and in six other places, has happily been removed from the text, where we now read "man child" instead. It stands, however, in the margin.

More important than the removal of obsolete or offensive words and expressions is the correction of numerous errors of translation found in the Authorized Version. In this, more than in anything else, lies the excellence of the Revision. It must be acknowledged that, if we consider the scanty aids at their command, King James's translators did wonderfully well. There are in the Old Testament many words which occur only once, or at least so rarely that it is difficult to determine their meaning. In these cases, the early translators had recourse to the Septuagint or Vulgate, or, if satisfied with the renderings of these versions, they guessed at the sense. But since their

day, and especially during the last fifty years, Hebrew philology has made remarkable progress, both in lexicography and grammar. Much that was obscured at the beginning of the seventeenth century has been made perfectly intelligible by later research; so that the scholars of to-day are in a better position than ever before to give a clear and accurate translation of the Old Testament Scriptures.

Have the Revisers been faithful to their task? We are happy to believe that, in the main, as regards the faithful reproduction of the Massoretic text, they have. They have rectified many mistakes and cleared up many obscurities. This is especially true of the poetical books, and more particularly of the book of Job, which has difficulties peculiar to itself, that baffled the learning of the seventeenth century. But improved renderings will be found in all the books. There is, of course, much room for criticism. Every Hebrew scholar will object to some of the changes made, and desire others that have not been made. It should be remembered, however, that the Revisers were bound by the two-thirds rule, so that in many instances renderings have been retained, not because they were believed to be accurate, but because no substitute proposed could command the necessary support. In these circumstances, we have reason to be thankful that the work, while full of shortcomings, is as good as it is, and that the English Bible, as revised, is so much improved.

We had intended to direct attention to special classes of emendations, both in the way of criticism and of approval—to the introduction of new words, and especially the transliteration of Hebrew terms, such as *Sheol*, *Azazel* and others—and to the alternative renderings contained in the margin; but our space forbids. Opportunity may present itself in the future for discussing particular questions. At this time, however, we can only add that the Revised Version, however excellent, will in all probability never supersede the Authorized Version and become what that has been for two centuries and a half—the People's Bible.

II.

THE FIRST LATIN APOLOGIST FOR CHRISTIANITY.

BY TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D.

It is only of recent years that the branch of theology concerned with the defence of the truth against opponents has been developed into a system and taken the name of Apologetics. Planck and Schleiermacher and Sack began the scientific treatment of the subject. But the materials for it have existed in every age from the beginning, yet in widely different forms. True, the fundamental questions have always been the same, but the form of the conflict has continually varied. Almost every century produced a new class of opponents whose objections took shape from the characteristic features of the time, and therefore required to be met with new weapons and a new exhibition of Christianity's inherent superiority over all that can be brought against it. Nor can we doubt that this will continue to be the case until the end. Meanwhile it is interesting to look back upon the past, and see how the early defenders of the faith acquitted themselves in the formidable debate.

The subject of this article, Marcus Minucius Felix, takes us near the beginning. He was preceded by Justin Martyr, Athenagoras and others, but they wrote in Greek, while Minucius was the first to clothe his arguments in a Latin dress. Of his birthplace, parentage and education, we know nothing. That he was of North African descent has been reasonably conjectured from the fact that he speaks of the orator Fronto as *Cirtensis nostra*, and Fronto, it is well known, was born of an Italian family in Cirta (the modern Constantine), in Africa.

He came to Rome in the reign of Hadrian, and acquired a high reputation as rhetorician and statesman. Antoninus Pius* made him preceptor to his two adopted sons, and afterwards Consul. Minucius seems to have resembled his distinguished townsman, for it appears from the statements of Lactantius and Jerome, as well as from certain expressions of his own in his *Apology*, that he was a rhetorician and an advocate or juris-consult at Rome, where he resided, and that he at times took part in the proceedings against the Christians. But along with his bosom friend, Octavius, he was converted, and became an advocate of the faith he once endeavored to destroy. It does not appear that he ever entered the clerical state, but as a layman he served his new Master in a different yet important way arising from the circumstances of the time. Hitherto all *Apologies* had necessarily been in Greek, for the Churches of Rome and almost all the West were, so to speak, Greek religious colonies. Their language, their organization, their Scriptures, were Greek, and many vestiges and traditions show that their ritual was Greek. Through Greek the communication of the Churches with the East was constantly kept up. Greek was the commercial language throughout the Empire, and in it the Emperor Marcus Aurelius wrote his philosophy. The Gospels and the Apostolic writings so soon as they became part of the public worship, were read, just as the Old Testament was, in Greek. The oldest inscriptions in the Catacombs are mostly in the same language. But the time came when this peculiarity ceased to exist. The spread of the Gospel and the separation of the East and the West, after the foundation of Constantinople, required that the Roman tongue should come into use. This began in North Africa where the Greek never

* Renan reminds us that one evening when the Emperor was nearly sixty years old all the pictures of his pious youth returned to his remembrance and he passed some delicious hours in calculating how much he owed to each one of the virtuous beings who had surrounded him. Among these he mentions Fronto, "who taught him the envy, duplicity and hypocrisy which belong to a tyrant, and the hardness which may exist in the heart of a patrician." (Comment. A. 11.)

prevailed farther East than Cyrenaica, and where the conquerors displaced the old Punic tongue by the Latin. It is with reason supposed that the earliest of the many Italic versions of the Scriptures on which Jerome grounded his Vulgate were of African origin. It was needful then to have a defence of the faith in the tongue now become dominant, and to adapt it to the characteristics of the Latin mind. It was not so much profound philosophical disquisition that was required as a practical enforcement of the claims of Christianity and a clear exhibition of its moral excellence. And it was to this task Minucius addressed himself, choosing the graceful form of a dialogue in which to set forth, in the speech of Cicero and Virgil, the truth on the highest themes of human thought.

His work has been preserved to us in a single manuscript now in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, from which, however, it has frequently been reprinted from 1543 to 1881. At first by a strange blunder, (the confusion of *Octavianus* with *octavus*), it was published not as an independent work, but as the eighth book of the treatise of Arnobius, *Adversus nationes libri VII.*, which is given in the same codex. The error was corrected by Franciscus Baldúinus in 1560. The text is often uncertain and in many places manifestly corrupt, so that it is not easy always to ascertain the sense. Yet enough remains to have won high encomiums from acknowledged masters of style. Thus Renan in his little book on *Marc-Aurele* says that it is "the pearl of the apologetic literature of the last years of Marcus Aurelius," and Milman declares "Perhaps no late work, either Pagan or Christian, reminds us of the golden days of Latin prose so much as this." However, to avoid misapprehension it may be well to append the judgment of the latest German editor, Bernhard Dombart, (Erlangen 1881), who says that to one who looks only on the surface Minucius presents the appearance of a classic style, because he formed himself on the ancient models and frequently made direct use of their expressions; but on a closer inspection it is apparent that in language he was a child of his time, a time in which archaisms,

provincialisms and neologisms played a conspicuous part. Still he wrote with spirit and force, often has eloquent and effective passages, and sometimes puts a point with the neatness of a Tacitus, as in the clause, *Non eloquimur magna sed vivimus*.

The date of the work has been much contested, and is still *sub lite*. Some place it in the first quarter of the third century, probably during the peaceful reign of Alexander Severus. So Dr. Schaff who cites the authorities *pro* and *con*, with his usual skill and fairness, in his Church History, II. 841. Others (Eberts, Mangold, Dombart) put it back into the preceding century; and the veteran scholar, Theodor Keim, in his posthumous *Rom und Christentum* says it was written between A. D. 178 and 180, and probably in A. D. 187, in the beginning of the persecution under Marcus Aurelius. To this he is led by the mention of the orator Fronto, the well-known companion of the Emperor, and by the reference to the various forms of violence to which the Christians are said to be subjected. The matter is of importance only as settling the mutual relations of Tertullian and Minucius. As there are numerous passages in both which are strikingly similar, one must have borrowed from the other. But if Minucius flourished in the reign of Marcus Aurelius then he was the original writer, for the *Apologeticus* of Tertullian was not written until the reign of Septimus Severus, between A. D. 197 and 200.

The work may recount an actual discussion, but more probably is a rhetorical expansion and orderly arrangement of several such discussions. As such it displays no small literary ability. The author appears possessed of all the culture of his time, and is skilful in the delineation of nature and of character and of life. As a recent convert he treats the matter upon the surface, by no means entering into the depths of Christian doctrine, but touching only such points as were handled by the Apostle Paul in his address at Athens. But there is no reason for inferring from this, as do Renan and Kuhn, that the author was ignorant of the specific tenets of the Christian faith, or was a liberal Christian of the Deistic

stamp. It did not belong to his purpose to treat of sin and grace, of Christ and redemption, of the Holy Ghost and His operations. Perhaps he did not feel himself qualified to handle these high themes, or, more probably, he wished to perform the preliminary work of dispelling prejudice and preparing men for a candid view of the peculiar truths of the Gospel. Hence he dwells upon the points in which Christians presented the sharpest and most obvious contrast to the prevailing heathenism of Rome. While attacking the follies and sins of idolatry, all the positive truths he sets forth are the unity of the Godhead, the universality of Divine providence, the resurrection of the body and future retribution, together with the actual results of these tenets upon the hearts and lives of Christians. "Christianity is to him both theoretically and practically the true philosophy which teaches the only true God, and leads to true virtue and piety."

The dialogue form of the work was doubtless in deference to the taste of antiquity for that mode of discussion. It does not have the grace and ease and liveliness of the Platonic writings, but is more allied to Cicero's well-known discussion *De Natura Deorum*, from which it borrows both thoughts, and the style and tone in which they are expressed. Minucius does not set up men of straw which fall down of themselves, or can easily be overthrown, but makes the heathen interlocutor state the very substance and force of the popular objections to Christianity as it was regarded by intelligent Romans of that day. We propose to give a rapid *précis* of the argument, using for this purpose the suggestions derived from a variety of sources, but constantly referring to the original.

In a graceful introduction the author begins by saying that in thinking of his departed friend Octavius Januarius with whom he had long been united in the closest intimacy, nothing impressed him so deeply as the recollection of the weighty discourse by which Octavius had been the means of winning over to the truth their common friend, Cæcilius. The occasion and the features of this discourse he now proceeds to recount.

Octavius had been called to Rome both by his engagements as an advocate and by his love for Minucius. It was a very joyful reunion. After some days they took advantage of a vacation of the courts to visit Ostia to enjoy the salt water bathing. There they met Cæcilius Natalis, another friend of Minucius, but still a heathen, and, as appears from his reasoning, a philosopher of the sceptical school of the New Academy. One fine morning as they strolled together along the beach, a statue of Serapis came in sight. As soon as Cæcilius saw it he raised his hand to his mouth and gave the customary sign of adoration. Whereupon Octavius rebuked Minucius because he had the heart to leave so dear and intimate a friend in the darkness of gross superstition. Then in animated conversation they continued their walk by the sea, at times pausing to join in the children's sport as they strove to see who could throw shells the farthest distance in skimming the surface of the waves. While they were thus engaged Cæcilius paid no attention, but stood apart, silent, uneasy and with a cloud upon his brow. When asked the reason of his grave demeanor, he answered that he had been vexed by the speech of Octavius covertly charging him with ignorance, and proposed that there should be a friendly discussion of the question at issue. This was agreed to, and the two friends sat down on the large stones placed for the protection of the baths, Minucius taking his place between them to act as umpire of the debate.

This was opened by Cæcilius. He began by assuming the position of doubt which at that period was generally accepted, and inveighed indignantly at the new blind faith which, notwithstanding the constant flux of earthly things and men's total inability to understand the supernatural, assumed to be able to furnish definite views of God and divine things. Much better is it to submit humbly to the traditions of our forefathers. The Roman deities had made Rome great, had given her the victory in countless battles, had laid at the feet of the city on the Tiber the dominion of the world. Do not the Romans govern and reign without your God? The greatest and best portion of you

are the prey of want and cold, are naked and hungry. Your God suffers this, and seems not to know it. Either he cannot, or will not, help his own; thus he is either weak or unjust. He can help those who come to life again, but he does nothing for the living. It is the height of imprudence and folly for a wretched set of ignorant men and credulous women to reject our ancient deities, and sacrifice all present earthly good in the empty prospect of that which is far distant and uncertain. Yet as it is the nature of evil to grow, this hateful system has spread itself everywhere, a religion of great secret crimes, promiscuous incest and frightful abominations. I hear that they adore the head of an ass, that basest of creatures. Some say that they worship the *virilia* of their pontiff and priest, and adore the nature as it were of their common parent. [This was simply transferring to the Christians the slander circulated about the Jews. Thus there was circulated, as Tertullian tells us, a picture of a figure with the ears of an ass, clothed with a toga, holding a book in its hands, with these words inscribed beneath, "The God of the Christians, born of an ass." So likewise among the ruins of the palace of the Cæsars in Rome, there has recently been found a sketch, roughly drawn with charcoal on the wall, representing a man with an ass's head hanging on a cross, and below, in rude Greek letters, "Alexamenos adores his God." Evidently a scoff of the soldiers at some Christian comrade.] Of the story about the initiation of novices Cæcilius says it is as much to be detested as it is well known. Then he recites the slaughter of an infant, the dividing of its limbs and the licking up of its blood, by which the partakers are pledged together and covenanted to mutual silence. At their feasts when they have become intoxicated, a dog that has been tied to the chandelier is provoked by throwing a morsel beyond him to rush and spring, and by the leap he extinguishes the light, and in the darkness thus occasioned deeds of the most abominable lust are committed and the wildest orgies celebrated, and this in an assembly where persons of every sex and every age are gathered. Things so utterly impious and detestable,

and only to be mentioned with apology would not be reported unless there were some foundation in truth. But Cæcilius states them upon the authority of "our Cirtensian," the orator Fronto, who appears to have been present at some of the persecutions. And that this testimony is true, that the shameless features here only partly stated really belong to the Christians, is shown by the fact that they carefully conceal their cultus. They have no temples, nor altars, nor images. They do not speak in public, and hold no public assemblies. Their one isolated God, whom as the god of the Jews the Romans enslaved, together with the people that worshiped him, is, they insist, while invisible yet everywhere present, anxiously caring for each individual and at the same time upholding the whole world. Nay, they go so far in their silliness as to announce the destruction of the heavens and the earth, the present divine order of things, and yet they confidently cherish for themselves the old wives' fable of a resurrection from the dead. In this delusion they oppose the cremation of the dead, and expect for themselves a life of endless felicity, while others as unrighteous must suffer eternal punishment, and all this as an arbitrary appointment of God. Yet manifestly the body of the dead is resolved into dust, and in innumerable ages not a single individual has come back from the grave. And their credulity prevents them from seeing that even in the present world they are altogether forsaken of God since they are exposed to trials and persecutions, so that, wretched as they are, they neither rise again nor do they really live in the meanwhile. Cease, therefore, to pry into the regions of the sky, or explore the destinies of a world which you are wholly unable to understand. Or, if you will philosophize, do it after the manner of Socrates or Simonides who modestly confessed that we cannot fathom the essence of the divine. This position of doubt is the only middle ground between a childish superstition and the destructive denial of all religion.

Having thus spoken Cæcilius ended with a smile of triumph.

"What can Octavius, a man of Plautian stock,* chief of the bakers and last of the philosophers, say to this?" Minucius cautioned him against a premature exaltation. His fine speech was indeed enticing, but the question was to be settled not by brilliant eloquence but solid argument. Cæcilius deprecated this as a partizan utterance unbecoming an umpire, and Minucius apologized.

Now begins Octavius. He will wash away the reproaches upon Christianity with a stream of truthful speech. But he cannot pass in silence the wavering character of his opponents position. He says he believes in the Gods, and again he is considering whether he does believe or not, so that his answer rests on no firm ground. This is not owing to any artifice on his part but arises from the actual uncertainty of one who does not know the right way. The truth alone will deliver him from his perplexity. Then Octavius proceeds to consider matters in detail. He says that the argument of Cæcilius has three heads.

I. The first concerns the *knowledge of God*. Cæcilius is displeased that poor uncultivated people should discuss heavenly things. But every man without distinction of race or condition is endowed with reason. It is a gift of nature. Even the philosophers themselves for the most part emerged from the people. The rich are used to gaze more upon their wealth than upon heaven, while our people though poor have found out wisdom and imparted it to others. Cæcilius is right in saying that man must learn to know himself, and to know the world, its essence and its origin, whether collected from the elements, or composed of atoms, or a divine creation. But to do this, he must know the universe and even the deity, without which he cannot know even humanity. It is man's distinction from the brute creation that he looks upward and knows God. They have no reason,

* This is aimed at the lowly origin of the Christians. Plautus is said when in need to have labored at a baker's hand-mill, a very menial occupation. The gibe at Octavius is that however eminent he might be at his mean handicraft, he was disqualified for a philosophical discussion.

no sense, no eyes, who derive the world from a fortuitous concourse of atoms. What can be plainer to him who opens his eyes than that there is one supreme intelligence that governs all things? The heavens, the stars, the succession of days and years, seed-time and harvest, the ebb and flow of the ocean, the formation of the animals, and above all that of man himself, indicate a divine artificer. All is so orderly and harmonious. Just as when one enters a house exquisitely proportioned and furnished he cannot doubt that a master presided over it. The only question one can ask is whether the author be one or many, but even that not seriously. For why more than one? Even the bees have but one king, and the herds but one leader. How can man divide the power at work in the heavens? No: God, the Father of all, has neither beginning nor end. He gives birth to all but gives eternity to Himself. Before the world, He was to Himself instead of the world. He orders all that is by a word; arranges it by His wisdom; perfects it by His power. Man does not see Him, does not comprehend Him, for He is greater than all perceptions, is infinite, immeasurable, known only to Himself. The human heart is too narrow to conceive Him. He needs no name. Names are required only where we separate a multitude into individuals. God is alone, and therefore *God* is His whole name. Every other title, Father, King, Lord, implicates Him in the earthly, the mortal. Nor am I singular in this opinion. When people look up to heaven they say simply, "God," "God is great," "God is true," "if God permits." Is that the utterance of people in general, or of a professed Christian? Even the poets speak of one father of gods and men. Virgil tells of one God whose Spirit pervades the universe. Thales declared God to be the Spirit that formed all things out of water; the first philosopher who disputed about heavenly things is therefore in absolute agreement with us. The same is true of Anaximenes, Anaxagoras, Pythagoras. Even Democritus and Epicurus, weak as they were, were not wholly destitute of the true faith. A host of others is mentioned. Plato has spoken in the plain-

est way, only his discourse is sometimes soiled by a mixture of merely civil belief, but his *Timæus* agrees almost wholly with us. So that the philosophers hold to one God with many names, and one might suppose either that Christians are now philosophers, or that the philosophers were then already Christians.

II. *The Argument from Antiquity.* If the world is really governed by one God, the appeal to ancient beliefs should not win our consent to the opposite error. For our ancestors had such an easy faith in falsehoods that they believed the monstrous absurdities of a Scylla, a chimaera, a hydra, centaurs, and the transformation of men into beasts. Thus they became credulous in divine things. Devotion toward kings and leaders, to whom statues were erected, led to the worship of such heroes. Here history agrees with us. Euhemerus describes exactly the origin of the gods, their birthplace, their countries, their exploits and where they were buried. Saturn fled before Jupiter to Latium. Jupiter reigned in Crete and died there. And so Prodicus and Persæus affirm. Even the mysteries contain stories of Isis weeping over Osiris, and Ceres seeking Proserpine. Jupiter is suckled by a she-goat. The form and appearance of the gods contradict their claims. Vulcan is a lame God; Apollo smooth-faced after so many ages; Æsculapius well bearded; Neptune with sea-green eyes; Minerva with eyes bluish-grey; Juno with ox-eyes; Mercury with winged feet; Pan with hooved feet; Saturn with feet in fetters; Janus with two faces; Diana is a huntress with her robe girded up high, or has many and fruitful breasts, or is horrible with three heads and many hands; and so with the rest. Who, indeed, is able to recount it all? But from ignorant parents we get such fables, and elaborate them in our studies, especially in the verses of the poets; for which reason Plato rightly banished from his imaginary commonwealth Homer, the creator of your gods. Who does not see the senselessness of this practice in the gods of to-day, when Romulus is deified by a false oath and Juba by the good will of the Mauritanians, when old men [he

refers to Vespasian] prefer to remain mortal and fear to be made gods? Are these who were born and then died really gods? For if so, one might ask why are they not born in our day also? Has Jupiter become too old? If they continued to propagate, heaven and earth could not contain the 'gods that would be produced, but the propagation has doubtless ceased because these fables are no longer believed. It is plain then that these beings were nothing but men, and they who worship their images were deceived by the perfection of the art shown in those images. Still it is a folly to make gods out of metal, molten or carved. The dumb animals know better, for the mice gnaw these statues, and the spiders weave webs over them without fear. Thus in blind attachment to their ancestors originated the Roman superstition of venerating silver and gold. If we investigate old usages we must laugh as well as weep. For instance, the foolish worship of the Luperici, the Galli, the Salii. The defence of the general madness is the multitude of the mad people. Some indeed say that it was the piety of the Roman people, and not their valor, that established their empire. Certainly their righteousness was distinguished from the beginning, since we know that they were a colony of criminals, a patricidal king, men who stole their wives and then warred against the kindred of these women, men who carried fire and sword in every direction. Whatever they hold is the spoil of their audacity. Their temples are built on the ruins of cities and the murder of priests. The worship of vanquished gods is open mockery. Not because they were religious did the Romans become great, but because they were sacrilegious with impunity. How could their gods help them? Romulus and Picus, Pavor and Pallor, how could such deities, the foster-children of Roman superstition, be the cause of their growth? Nor was it the foreign gods; for if these could not help their own people, how could they avail for others? Or, is it said that it was because of the greater modesty of Roman maidens and the superior piety of Roman priests? But the greater number of the vestal virgins were punished for unchastity, and the impunity of the

rest was due not to their merit, but to their better fortune. No where is uncleanness more common than in the temples and among the altars, and the chambers of the priests are more impure than the stews themselves. Finally, how many mighty kingdoms were there of old, Assyrians, Medes, Persians, Greeks, Egyptians, which yet had no pontiffs, nor salii, nor vestals, nor augurs! Cæcilius has referred with special emphasis to auspices and auguries. How easy it is to confute him! Regulus was imprisoned despite the bird omen; the consul Paulus had greedy chickens [a favorable omen] before the disastrous defeat of Cannæ; against all signs Caius Cæsar went to Africa, yet had he only an easier voyage and a speedier victory. Who dare talk of oracles? Amphiaraus prophesied after his death, but before it knew not the treachery of his own wife. Tiresias could see the future, but being blind could not see the present. Ennius composed the replies of Apollo, and Demosthenes charged the Pythia with *Philippizing*. Whatever is true in these responses is due to the action of *dæmones*, such as Plato speaks of. These unclean spirits dwell in the sanctuaries and by their afflatus attain the authority as of a present deity. They control the flight of birds, animate the fibres of the entrails, direct the lots, inspire the seers and the magicians, possess the bodies of men, and set the Bacchantes off in their furious course. Many of you know that the demons themselves have confessed this when driven out from men "by the torment of our words and the fire of our prayers." Even Saturn, Serapis, and Jove and others, overcome by pain, acknowledge who they are; and certainly they would not lie to their own shame, especially when any of you are standing by.

III. The *Demons cause the prevailing hatred and lies against the Christians*. Believe us who now repent of our old prejudices that these prejudices are unjustifiable. We once believed that Christians worshipped monsters, devoured infants, joined in incestuous banquets. It never occurred to us that it was only demons who circulated these reports which were never enquired into nor proved; that no Christian ever sought pardon

or favour by betraying such atrocities; that no one ever blushed that he became a Christian, but only because he had not done so earlier. How perverse we were! Temple-robbers, incestuous persons, parricides had a fair trial, but Christians we would not listen to for a moment. We tortured them to compel them to a lie in order to escape death. And if the pain proved too great for some infirm believer, and he renounced his faith, we acquitted him at once as if the simple denial atoned for all his misdeeds. Do you not see that from the experience of to-day? For if reason and not the instigation of a demon were to judge, Christians would have been urged not to disavow their faith, but to confess themselves guilty of incests and like abominations. From the demons also come all false reports. It is they who make you believe that we honor an ass's head as something divine. Who is so foolish as to do this, or so much more foolish as to believe such a story? It is you rather who with your *Epona* consecrate the whole ass in your stables, and adorn the same together with Isis in your religious fervor. You also venerate and offer up the heads of oxen and sheep, and you dedicate gods, half man and half goat, and gods with the faces of dogs and lions. With the Egyptians, you adore and feed the bull Apis, and you make no objection to their sacred rites in honor of serpents, crocodiles, birds and fishes. Even the pungency of an onion you fear as much as Isis, and the base wind of the body as Serapis. He who fables about our worshipping the *pudenda* of the priest ascribes to us what really belongs to himself. Such obscene worship may exist among those with whom immodesty passed for a fine art, who envy the license of prostitutes, who indulge in unnatural lusts, who cease their shameless course rather from satiety than from shame. Such infamies we cannot listen to; it would be a disgrace to defend ourselves farther. You invent, concerning chaste and modest persons, things of which we could not believe that they occurred anywhere, did we not see them among you.

But, you say, we worship a criminal and his cross! Far

from it. A criminal deserves not, an earthly being is not able, to be esteemed divine. The Egyptians indeed, choose a man whom they may worship. A false flattery gives to princes the title of gods whereas honor and love are their more rightful due. Yet men invoke their deity; they pray to their images; and it is safer to swear falsely by the genius of Jupiter than by that of the king. Crosses, moreover, we neither worship nor desire. You who consecrate wooden images adore crosses perhaps as parts of your gods, for your very standards, your banners and flags, what are they but gilded crosses? A ship with sails, a military yoke set up, a man praying with extended hands, have the form of a cross. This sign therefore is either supported by a natural reason, or your own religion is formed in regard to it. We are initiated, you say, by blood and the slaughter of an infant. Who can believe this but one who is capable of doing it? You expose your children to wild beasts, or strangle them, or destroy them even before birth. And your gods! Saturn devoured his sons. In Africa parents sacrificed their own children. Human sacrifices were offered among the Tauri and the Galli. The Roman sacrificers buried alive a Greek man and a Greek woman, and to this day Jupiter Latiaris is worshipped by them with murder. Cataline conspired under a compact of blood, Bellona's worship is steeped in gore, and epilepsy is healed with human blood. Similar are those who devour wild beasts from the arena fattened with the flesh of men. To us it is not lawful to see or hear of homicide, and we do not use in our food the blood even of eatable animals. The story of our incestuous banqueting is another false plot of the demons. Even your Fronto joined in the calumny. But do not such things belong to yourselves? Among the Persians the commerce of sons and mothers is permitted, and in Egypt that of brothers and sisters. Your histories and tragedies relate such things for your pleasure, and your gods perform them; hence incest is often detected among you and always permitted. Indeed it is inevitable, since your promiscuous concubinage must needs bring you in contact with

children you have exposed or abandoned. As for us we maintain modesty not merely in appearance, but in heart. We abide by a single marriage, and have either but one wife for the sake of children, or none. Our feasts are not only modest, but temperate; seriousness controls hilarity. We maintain pure speech and still purer bodies. Many are celibates through life, more for enjoyment than from pride; and so far are we from incestuous desires that some blush even at the thought of a modest intercourse.

Nor are we people of the lowest class because we refuse your honors and purple robes, or factious because we agree in one mind. Nor are we "garrulous in corners," since you either blush or fear to hear us in public. Our growth shows not our error, but our repute. In such a course of life as we pursue, our original number remains undiminished, and strangers increase it. We distinguish each other not by an outward mark, but by the tokens of innocence, humility and love in which we all are brethren, but which you do not know, for you do not acknowledge one another as brethren unless indeed for the purpose of fratricide. You think that we conceal our worship because we have no temples or altars. But what image am I to make of God, since man himself is the image of God? And what temple, since the whole world which He made cannot contain Him? Should I not dedicate to Him my own spirit rather than one little building? What oblation shall I make? Shall I ungratefully throw back His own gifts which He bestowed for my use? No: a good disposition, a pure mind, a clear conscience, the saving of other men, these are the best sacrifices. Certainly we can neither show nor see the God we worship. We believe in Him because while we see Him not, we perceive His works. We see not the wind or the sun, but only their effects, and how can we see the Spirit who is their Lord? We see not our own souls, how can we see Him? But this does not hinder Him from seeing and directing all. Even the sun, a mere creature, is fixed fast in the heaven, yet it is diffused over all lands equally. How much more is God who made all thing everywhere present?

Nor let us flatter ourselves because of our multitude. Men seem many to themselves, but to God we are very few. We distinguish people and nations; to God this whole world is one family, and he unlike an earthly king sees it directly and thoroughly, for we live not only in His eyes but in His bosom. You deride the Jews, and affirm that their superstition, their temples and altars, availed them nothing. But you forget that in the days of their uprightness and piety, from a few they became many, from poor became rich, from being servants became kings, and often with a few unarmed men, even when fleeing, at God's command they became victors, the very elements striving on their behalf. Read their Scripture or if you prefer Roman writings, the books of Josephus or of Antoninus Julianus. There you will learn that God forsook them only when they forsook Him, and that nothing befell them which had not been predicted in case of their being obdurate. Is the future conflagration of the world incredible? It is a vulgar error not to believe it. What wise man does not know that all that had a beginning, even heaven itself, must come to end? Have not Stoics and Epicureans foretold the final fire? Plato says that though the world was made eternal and indestructible, yet to God Himself, its author, it is both dissoluble and mortal. Thus the philosophers reason as we do, not because we follow them but they learn from us, imitating, but also corrupting, divine truth. Thus the doctrine of another life is set forth by Pythagoras, and especially Plato, but in a disfigured form. They teach that the soul survives death and passes into a new body, but add the misrepresentation that it passes into the forms of birds and beasts—a sentiment worthy only of a buffoon. Still it is enough for the argument if your wise men agree with us in some measure. And who now is so foolish 'as to deny that God who first created man can restore him again? Do you think that whatever escapes our dull eyes is therefore lost from God? Bodies may be resolved into ashes or smoke, but they still exist in Him in their elements. Nor do we fear any loss from cremation, but we use the ancient and better custom of burying in the earth. See therefore how for

our comfort all nature suggests a future resurrection! The sun sinks and arises, stars pass away and return, flowers wilt and bloom again, seeds decay and revive, As one now waits for the spring of the year, so may he wait for the spring-time of the body? Most men in the consciousness of what they deserve rather desire than believe that after death they shall be no more, and their error is confirmed by their present impunity owing to God's patience. But do not the books of the learned, the sayings of the poets, predict to them the Stygian marsh and eternal torments? And what worse do we say? Nor can you comfort yourselves with the thought that this occurs by fate, for you have your freedom. And it is not a man's social position but his conduct that comes under judgment.

That many of us are called poor is not our disgrace but our glory. Luxury weakens the soul, frugality strengthens it. And yet who can be called poor who does not desire the possession of others? And no one is so poor as every man is at his birth. Birds live without any patrimony, and day by day the cattle are fed, and still these creatures are born for us, all which we possess if we do not lust after them. Without baggage we march easier. Did we count wealth needful for our welfare we should ask it of God, and He would give it to us. But we rather scorn riches and seek after virtue. Bodily suffering is not punishment, but a warfare which invigorates the frame. Even your own heroes have become illustrious through trials. We do not suffer because God despises us or is unable to help, but because He is refining us as gold in the fire. How fair a spectacle is the Christian when he enters the lists with affliction, and does battle against menaces and tortures; when he scoffs at the terror of the hangman, and maintains his liberty against kings and princes, yielding only to God whose he is. Like a conqueror he tramples upon the man who condemns him, for he is victor who obtains that for which he contends, which is not deliverance, but the approval of his Lord. He fights under the eye of God and is sure of his reward. He may seem to be miserable; he cannot really be found to be so. You

exalt some of your sufferers to the skies; such as Mutius Scaevola, who having missed his aim in an attempt to kill the king, voluntarily thrust the mistaking hand into the fire. Yet how many of us have suffered not only the hand but the whole body to be burned without a complaint, when deliverance was in our power! But why should I compare our men with Mucius or Regulus, when our very children, inspired with patience, despise your racks and wild beasts and all other tortures? And do you not see that no one is willing without reason to undergo punishment, or is able without God to bear tortures? Or are you deceived by the fact that men who know not God abound in riches, and honor, and power? Miserable men! they are raised higher that they may fall the deeper. They are fattened as beasts for the shambles; they are crowned as victims for the altar. Some are lifted up to empire that they may make the greatest misuse of their power to their own undoing. For apart from God what happiness can there be when death comes? Are you a king, and rich, and proud of the fasces and the purple? Still you are alone in face of the dread necessity, and carry a heavy burden during life's short journey. You shine in the purple but are sordid in mind. With reason, therefore, do we renounce your amusements and spectacles. We know that they arose from your heathen worship, and we condemn their mischievous influence: people brawling in the chariot games, murder taught in the gladiatorial contests, debauchery and adultery represented in the theatres, and emasculated actors depicting the shameless acts of your gods. You demand murder in fact while you weep over it in fiction.

Men censure our aversion to libation cups and aught connected with idol sacrifices, yet this is not a confession of fear but an assertion of liberty. We know that God's gifts cannot be corrupted by any agency, but we abstain lest you should think that we submit to the demons to whom libation has been made, or that we are ashamed of our religion. We are not afraid of flowers; we gather the lily and the rose in spring; we strew them on our couches and wear them on our bosoms; but

pardon us for not placing them as chaplets on our heads, for we are accustomed to take in the scent with our nostrils and not with the back of the head or the hair. Nor do we cover the dead with garlands, for if they are happy, they feel no want, and if miserable they are beyond the refreshment of flowers. We bury our dead in the same quiet way in which we live, not binding to us a fading wreath, but wearing one that comes to us from God, alive with imperishable flowers. Thus we both shall rise again in blessedness, and are already living in happy contemplation of the future. Let Socrates, the Athenian jester, shut himself up in his avowed ignorance; let Arcesilaus also, and Carneades and Pyrrho, and all the race of sceptics, doubt on; let Simonides procrastinate for ever; we despise the bent brows of the philosophers whom we know to be corrupters of the truth and always eloquent against the vices they practice; we who bear wisdom not in our dress but in our minds, we do not speak great things, but we live them. We boast that we have attained what they sought for with the greatest eagerness but were not able to find.

When Octavius had finished his speech we all stood for some time in astonishment. I was lost in admiration of the way in which he had adorned those things which it is easier to think than to say, both by arguments and examples, and by authorities. He had refuted the ill-disposed with the very weapons of the philosophers with which they are armed, and had moreover shown the truth not only as easy but as agreeable. While I was turning these things over in my mind, Cæcilius broke forth: "I congratulate my friend Octavius and also myself; and I do not wait for the decision. Even thus we have conquered; not unjustly do I assume to myself the victory. He indeed has conquered me, but I have a triumph over my error. Upon the chief points at issue, concerning Providence and concerning God, I yield, and I agree also as to the purity of the sect which is now my sect. There are some other matters on which I need instruction, but as the sun in declining we will defer them till

to-morrow." I too expressed my pleasure at the result, and the more as I was now spared the disagreeable duty of acting as umpire.

So we all separated with joy, Cæcilius over his conversion, Octavius over his victory, and I over the conversion of the one and the victory of the other.

To an ordinary reader of the outline of Minucius's argument as here given, it would seem as remarkable for what it omits as for what it contains. There is not a word about the Trinity, or the Incarnation, or the Atonement, or the Holy Ghost, or the need and method of Justification, or the Second Advent, nay, not even about that which is the very citadel of modern Apologetics, the person and character of the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor does there drop from the orator's lips any expression of the gratitude, love and devotion which a Christian always feels toward his Redeemer. The reason of this has sometimes been sought in the supposed position of Minucius as only an incipient believer, standing in the fore-court of the temple, and, therefore, handling only those topics with which he was familiar. But it is not easy to see how he could believe what he here confesses without believing a great deal more. It is more natural to suppose that he adapted his argument to the class he meant to reach, and insisted on those points, the admission of which would logically involve the adoption of the whole Christian system, viz.: the existence and unity of God, the universality of His government of the world, the absurdity of idolatry, the falseness of the accusations made against Christians, their superior morals, their fortitude in sufferings, their faith in the resurrection of the body, and their present enjoyment in the knowledge and worship of God. No appeal is made to the Scriptures, because the authority of these was not acknowledged by his opponents. But if these opponents should be satisfied as to the ethical claims of the sect, the step would be a short one to the cordial reception of the doctrinal and Scriptural basis upon which Christian Ethics rests and always has rested.

But while the discussion is thus apparently superficial and limited, in the course of it expression is given to certain points which are still of interest notwithstanding the vast changes that have occurred during sixteen centuries. Among these is the vigorous rebuke to Agnosticism. "Nothing in Christianity," said Octavius, "more excites the anger of Cæcilius than its claim to be in possession of assured truth." At the close of the heathen's speech he laid it down thus: "In my opinion things which are uncertain ought to be left as they are." The confession of ignorance is the height of wisdom. He belonged to a large class in the days of the Empire. They had no longer any heart for the old religion, yet they did not venture directly to break with it. They reckoned it a sign of culture no longer to hold the ancient creed with exactness, and allowed themselves occasionally to scoff at it. Yet they were unwilling to have existing traditions disturbed, and so rejected all religious innovators on the ground that nothing can be determined with certainty. Such persons are to be met with in every age. They are incapable of profound knowledge and touch the subject of religion only on the surface. They deem it a mark of good-breeding not to dispute much upon such a topic, and whenever pressed somewhat closely seek refuge in the seeming impossibility of discovering the truth. But Minucius insists not only that truth may be, but that it actually has been ascertained. Man's own nature and his observation of the external world have furnished him with a certain and sufficient knowledge of divine things, so that it was only an affectation of wisdom and humility to boast of being in perpetual doubt. The refutation of the argument drawn from oracles and auspices is still of use in our day when the truth as it is in Jesus is attacked on the ground of occult powers of nature, or of messages from the unseen world, or of revelations that have no historical basis whatever. Superstition is the same now as it was then. If men do not have the truth, or having it reject it, they must needs turn to fables. They cannot stand in *equilibrio*.—The existence of evil spirits was never denied or

doubted by the early disciples. And they used the fact to explain some of the forms of portentous wickedness by which they were surrounded, in this following the example of Him who said in His parable, "An enemy hath done this." The cruel and insensate calumnies propagated concerning Christians indicate the amount of ignorant prejudice against which they had to contend, and they teach a lesson of patience to all who in other times and circumstances are spoken against falsely. On the other hand, the retort based upon the gross immoralities of heathenism, occurring not only in the lives of men, but in the narratives concerning the gods themselves, is still of use as suggesting the invariable characteristic of all religions of mere earthly origin. The stream cannot rise higher than its fountain, and if men deify their fellows, human sins as well as human virtues must share in the apotheosis. No trace of the asceticism which soon became common is found in the argument of Octavius. Marriage is recognized as lawful, and the only requisition made is that it should be monogamous. So the good things of this world are enjoyed but with moderation and sobriety. We hear nothing of those who "forbid to marry and command to abstain from meats." Nor is there any praise of voluntary poverty as an eminent virtue. It is admitted that Christians are for the most part poor, but this is regarded as an appointment of Providence to which they cheerfully submit, because it is God's will, and because it may be made a means of grace so that while poor enough in worldly goods, they are rich toward God.

Because Minucius mentions Euhemerus, it is not necessary to suppose that he held his theory that the mythological deities were originally mere mortal men raised to the rank of Gods on account of the benefits which they had conferred upon mankind. He dealt with the facts of the case. The treatise of Euhemerus had been translated into Latin by Ennius, and had found large acceptance among the cultivated Romans. This being the case Minucius makes an argument *ad hominem*, and skillfully presses the weak points of the system, holding up to ridicule the mani-

fold and manifest absurdities involved in a pantheon filled with such beings. Nor can any modern attempt to develop a symbolical meaning out of these monstrosities relieve them from the actual character and influence which the Apologist lays to their charge. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body was defended in the beginning very much as it is now. Acknowledging it as the assured belief of the Christians, the disputant on the one hand points to the analogies of nature, and on the other to the power of God for whom nothing is too hard. He certainly can re-form that which He formed at first. Here occurs an observation of interest in our own day. The Romans were used to burn the bodies of their dead, but Christians interred them, not however because cremation would put a difficulty in the way of resurrection, for nothing perishes to the eye of God, but because the other mode is ancient and better. The endlessness of future punishment is stated without reserve and in unqualified terms, and the more because the doctrine, unlike its fate in our day, was universally accepted by the heathen whose poets speak freely of the black abyss and fiery river and the eternal torments. The simple and robust faith of the Ante-Nicene age had no difficulty in taking the words of Scripture in their obvious meaning. And they traced the denial of a future state where it obtained among their contemporaries to a well grounded fear that such a renewed existence held out no hopeful prospect to them. "They would prefer to be altogether extinguished rather than to be restored for the purpose of punishment." Persecution for conscience's sake was borne with fortitude and patience, even by delicate women and young children. This was because they were supported by a consciousness of the presence and favor of God. The flames of the stake were only a refiner's fire, and the sufferers would rather have what seemed such a wretched lot that abound in riches and honors which at last would only precipitate them into a profounder abyss. Error has had its martyrs as well as truth, but in this case it was not fanaticism or simple obstinacy, as its enemies and among them the benign Marcus Aurelius asserted,

but a conviction of spiritual truth. And it is no small debt that the subsequent ages owe to the heroic courage and invincible constancy of these sufferers who insured the triumph of Christ's gospel. It is not so much the amount of suffering that excites admiration as the spirit with which it was borne. Men, women and children submitted to prolonged and excruciating agonies, not in any temper of stony hardihood, much less in wrath and revenge, but like their divine Master, with calm self-possession, humble resignation, gentle meekness, triumphant hope and forgiving charity. All was in the spirit of Him who said, "Being reviled we bless : being persecuted we suffer it." And thus the witness borne in deed and word was perfected in the witness of blood when the crown of martyrdom was conferred.

A recent American writer has endeavored to extenuate, if not to excuse, the fault of Marcus Aurelius in consenting to the persecution of the Christians, on the ground that the Christianity of Rome in that day was so disfigured by gross errors and heresies, such as the Ebionite, the Manichæan, the Gnostic, and also the Mithraic worship, that the fair lineaments of the truth could not be discerned. But this is a great error. The victims of the persecution were not errorists, but persons holding the common faith, such as Melito, bishop of Sardis, and Polycarp, bishop of Symrna, as well as the martyrs of a humbler rank, Pothinus, Ponticus and Blandina whose constancy at Lyons has been commemorated with affectionate devotion. Nor was it any peculiarity either of faith or of worship that provoked the wrath of the emperor. It was simply their persistent refusal to worship the gods of the empire. This was an insult to the national divinities. Aurelius himself had no faith in these deities, but as chief of the state, felt himself bound to pay respect to the objects of vulgar adoration. And what he did, surely any one else might be summoned to do. Besides, the Christians fell under the force of the laws against *actus illiciti*, and he felt it necessary for the safety of the state to see that it harbored no society differing from it. It was not malice nor frenzy, but a

sense of duty to the nation, that led him to resent and punish what he considered the unnatural obstinacy of the Christians. His fault lay in the haughty Stoic pride which hindered him from examining or appreciating the convictions which underlay this so-called obstinacy. Had he stooped to inquire into the wonderful combination of patience and meekness which was displayed, as Minucius tells us, even by women and children when under severe and protracted torture, he must have been convinced that there was a religion stronger and better than any philosophy. In such a case he would have stayed his hand from violence, and so avoided what even Mons. Renan considers a shadow resting upon his memory. He was as unlike Nero as any emperor possibly could be, and yet both have the blood of Christians upon their skirts.

III.

THE LIGHT OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

NEGATIVE ASPECT.

BY PROFESSOR EML. V. GERHART, D.D.

THE Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are a spiritual volume. Whilst the books of which it is composed are many, the volume itself is not a collection of disconnected pamphlets, but constitutes a self-consistent whole. Many books written by many men during a succession of ages extending through a period of time of not less than sixteen hundred years, unite to make but *one* Book. The Book is called *spiritual* inasmuch as it claims to have been indited, not by the will of man, but by the Spirit of God; and this spiritual Book is to be recognized as a unit, inasmuch as all its parts radiate from one central idea, are attuned to a single key-note, and are governed by a purpose, one and the same, from Genesis to the Apocalypse.

This spiritual Book has originated, not upon the natural plane of ordinary human life, but on the supernatural plane of the divine kingdom. Having originated in the kingdom of the Holy Ghost, it is designed primarily for such as through the agency of the Spirit live in fellowship with the Head of this kingdom. Within the pale of this spiritual realm Holy Scripture shines, not with earthly but with heavenly light; and its spiritual effulgence is seen by all such members of the kingdom as have a spiritual eye. Its light may be discerned also by all other men who open the eye of the soul to its radiance, and freely consent to be led and guided into its own-divine realm.

Such are the facts of Holy Scripture. Or if any one prefers a different term, such are its *pretensions*. Whether it be conceded that the claims of Scripture be facts, or only pretensions, the law that must govern the candid inquirer is in both cases the same. To form even an approximate judgment of its unique dignity and transcendent worth we must presume, not what non-sympathizing minds allege, but what the Bible claims on its own behalf. Whether Scripture be darkness or light, is a problem that earnest seekers after truth may solve on this principle, but on no other. And if it be admitted to be, not darkness, but light, the question as to the nature of its light, whether earthly or heavenly, natural or spiritual, must be answered on the same principle.

So unlike all purely human books, as is granted both by friends and foes; so unique as to its central idea; so extraordinary and independent in its demands, and so mighty in its commanding influence through long ages, Holy Scripture claims to shine by its own light. Human books do not illuminate its pages. Contrasted with its glory the light shining in human books is darkness. Refusing the feeble rays reflected from every lower realm, Scripture professes to illuminate itself. The central idea vivifying all its parts is the Sun in the firmament of the spiritual kingdom shedding light upon all the facts of history and every doctrinal truth.

Whether the so-called central idea be in reality central, or not; whether the light of Scripture be divine light or darkness,—this question those only can answer who have an eye for the light; and who, having an eye, open it to the light, that the light illuminating this spiritual realm may enter their souls and thus empower them, not only to see those mysteries which a spiritual eye alone may see, but also to discriminate between things in the spiritual realm and things in the natural world.

Accepting as the basis of inquiry into the light effulgent in Holy Scripture the presumption on which Scripture proceeds from the beginning to the end, we may speak of it negatively.

*

We may say *what is not the light peculiar to this sacred Book of Holy Scripture.*

1. The light is not *divine wisdom radiant in nature.*

We accept what is valid in pantheistic philosophy. God is a power immanent in matter and mind. He is in that which He has made and which he upholds, no less than He is above it and beyond it. The material world is not a mechanism exhibiting the handiwork of a great architect, as a locomotive illustrates the skill of a machinist. The original Former has not projected this work into time-worlds and space-worlds and then withdrawn from them, as a builder may withdraw from the mechanism constructed by his hand. But we grant that as the universe is of God, so God is in the universe. However different the finite is from the infinite, the creature from the Creator, yet there is no gulf of separation between the natural world and its Author. The same mysterious energy by which the work of God was spoken into existence, is ever active in all its laws and forces, upholding and filling and governing its operations with reference to the ends of divine Wisdom. The on-going like the beginning of the cosmos is by virtue of the divine will immanent in all its parts as in all its kingdoms. As St. Paul teaches there is one God and Father, who is above all, and through all, and in all.*

Thus connected perennially with its Author, the material universe is not gross external matter only. There is in it something not material, something different from liquids and solids, plants and animals, planets and fixed stars; a power other than attraction and repulsion, other than the laws of statics and dynamics; something ethereal and transcendent, speaking to the souls of men, of agencies invisible and intangible emanating from a region beyond the outward domain of gross matter, but pervading and transfusing all worlds with a presence intelligible only to the eye of a sympathizing mind. Nature has a soul no less than a body. The former has been seen and felt in every age as truly as the latter.

* Eph. 4: 6.

Of a transcendent presence and agency in nature, the external world has ever been speaking. The heavens declare the glory of God, says the Psalmist. The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead.* True as it is that spiritual darkness covers the earth, it is nevertheless true, also, according to the Written Word, that rays of divine light break through the clouds of darkness. Such luminous rays evidence to the conscience their transcendent Source and their divine power, somewhat as the light of the sun authenticates itself to the bodily eye.

This light of God shining from the creation of the world in things seen and tangible, is veritable light, a potent energy from above moving all great men who become the spokesmen of the universal moral and religious consciousness of our race. How real and mighty such transcendent illumination is, may be seen in the religions, the philosophies and arts of highly endowed pagan nations.

To the operation of this divine principle in the natural world Holy Scripture is not referable. Genuine though the light of nature may be, the light of Scripture claims nevertheless to be other in kind. Scripture even acknowledges the validity of the spiritual effulgence diffusing itself in the material and natural, whilst it professes to illumine the natural by shedding upon it light coming directly from a higher realm. Thus saith the Lord: is the formula of the books of the Old Testament; whilst He who claims to be the chief Prophet, the Alpha and Omega of that prevenient revelation, commonly addresses us by saying: Verily, verily, I say unto you. According to the Old Testament no man can by searching among the phenomena and processes of nature find out God;† and those who imagine that they can quench their soul-thirst by turning from the worship of Jehovah to the beliefs and ceremonies of pagan nations are compared to men who forsake the fountains of living water, and hew them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no

* Rom. 1: 20.

† Job. 11: 7-9.

water.* According to the New Testament, Jesus Christ is the true Light of the world. Contrasted with His glory, the light of nature is darkness. Such is the tenor of all the teaching of the gospels and epistles. Were it needful, numerous passages might be quoted illustrating the fact that Scripture, whilst it recognizes the presence of supernatural light in the natural world, nevertheless pronounces that light feeble and ineffectual. Besides, Scripture arrays itself throughout against the conceptions and interpretations of nature prevalent among pagan nations.

2. The light of Holy Scripture is not the light of the human reason.

Man is in one respect a member of the natural economy. The laws and functions of his corporeal existence are by virtue of innumerable connections vitally inwoven with the laws and forces of sub-human kingdoms. Of all natural processes of development he is the product and crown. Connected thus, nature includes man; from him its purest light is radiated. The light of God shining in the external world is a light shining in the wonder of His bodily organization. Reason is the exponent and the interpreter of divine agency in nature and in man.

But we may very properly distinguish between the soul and the body, between the light of God shining in the reason and that same light radiated from the world outside of man. Wonderful as may be the processes of nature, and rich as the material world may be in phenomena of divine wisdom and divine power, yet the highest physical organization is immeasurably inferior to human personality. The soul is a profounder depth than the unfathomable recesses of the earth, has an outlook compassed by no finite horizon, and is arched by a dome loftier and grander than the empyrean. This non-material microcosm is much richer in spiritual truth than the exterior material universe. Here the light of the infinite and the transcendent is shining with direct rays. Of this supernatural economy the

* Jer. 2: 13.

living soul has an immediate perception. God approaches man ; God touches man on the spiritual side of his being, and announces Himself by communications from His own infinite fullness, thrilling all the religious instincts of his life. Hence come beliefs in God, devotion to His service, the utterances of profound truths in the sphere of morals, and prophecies of future rewards or punishments. Among pagan nations there is intellectual culture worthy the name, and in their philosophies some wisdom that is true wisdom. St. Paul has even incorporated in his Epistles a few passages from pagan authors, which have thus become a part of the truth of divine revelation.*

But the reason is not content with its spiritual intuitions. Sometimes renouncing these intuitions it substitutes in their stead hypotheses ; hypotheses respecting the origin and laws of nature, respecting the existence of God, respecting the relation of spirit to matter, of the world to God, and of God to man. Systems of wisdom, profound, grand and beautiful, have been constructed, which, like the pyramids of Egypt, stand in the empire of thought as monuments of man's rational greatness and his spiritual omnipotence. Next to Christianity there is no light so luminous and penetrating, no power so permanent and far-reaching in all the spheres and relations of human life as the light of science and philosophy.

As Scripture does not deny the light of God radiant in the external natural world, so neither does Scripture ignore the light of God shining in the human reason, nor the divine truth perceived and wrought into system by human speculation. Of the heathen St. Paul says that they hold "the truth ;" but that they hold it in unrighteousness. He concedes that "they knew God ;" but teaches that when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful ; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.†

Whilst Scripture thus teaches that the light of God has been ever shining in the human soul, and acknowledges that such light has power for moral and spiritual ends, Scripture never-

* Acts 17 : 28.

† Rom. 1 : 21.

theless disclaims altogether that itself is illumined by that light. That light in paganism could not withstand the influences of darkness. However mighty it may be, that light fails to guide men in the ways of God, and fails to deliver them from the disease of sin and the dominion of death. The wisest pagan, though he feels the need of a higher wisdom and may even, as Plato did, faintly foreshadow some features of the "just man" as realized in Jesus Christ, yet he has no direct sympathy with the central truth of Holy Scripture. And revelation pronounces the wisdom of wise men foolishness.* Their doctrine of God in reality falsifies God. "The world by wisdom knew not God." That there is a Divine Being the world perceives; likewise that the homage of men is due to the Divine. But what God is, and by what means men might come into fellowship with Him, the world did not know. Quoting from the prophet, St. Paul says: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him." Respecting the spiritual weakness of man our Lord teaches the same thing. When the disciples were challenged by the question: "Whom say ye that I am?" Peter replied: "To whom shall we go but unto Thee, for Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." Then our Lord answered: "Blessed art thou Simon Bar-Jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." Neither the mind of Peter, nor the spiritual intelligence of mankind empowered him to discern in Jesus of Nazareth the Christ of God, and the true Light of the world, That power was given Him by a revelation from His Father.

Men may be illumined by all the rays of light shining forth from the soul in every epoch of the history of philosophy, yet they do not thereby come to possess the light radiant in Holy Scripture. They may also be deeply conscious of this want. If they study the written Word with unbiassed mind and teach-

* 1 Cor. 1. 19; 20: 21.

able disposition, even though the written Word does not find free access to their hearts, they will soon feel the contrast, if not the contradiction between the light of Scripture and the light of philosophy. Either philosophy will become the occasion of faith and a stepping-stone to Christianity, or, estranged by the thorough contrast, they will turn against Scripture and follow philosophy. The brilliant rays of the sun blind their diseased eyes, and they prefer the dim twinkling of the stars shining in the cloudy sky of reason.

3. The light of Holy Scripture is not the light of the conscience. Human nature is as certainly ethical as it is intellectual. Man is endowed with the faculty of volition no less than with understanding and reflection. He has the consciousness that there is an inviolable law of life and conduct to which he is amenable, and the authority of this law he spontaneously acknowledges. That law is the will of a Supreme Power ruling the affairs and destinies of mankind. Hence all have some idea of right and wrong, of the morally good and the morally evil, of reward consequent upon doing right, and of punishment consequent upon doing wrong. Men hold that they shall reap as they sow. Rewards and punishments follow right and wrong in this world and in the world to come. The universal sense of justice uniformly approves obedience to moral law and uniformly condemns disobedience.

The light of moral truth shines in many social customs of the heathen, shines in many of their proverbs, in their civil laws, and in the aphorisms of their sages. From the customs and manners, from the laws of heathen nations and the ethical doctrines of their greatest philosophers, a code of morality might be constructed which in many of its features would be like the morality of the Bible. Indeed, nearly every moral precept of the Old and New Testament has its dim shadow in pagan literature. The man who would live strictly according to the light radiated by the natural conscience would, like Marcus Aurelius, develop a moral character worthy the confidence and respect of Christians no less than of pagans.

Such moral light is of divine origin. God touches the conscience, announcing Himself as the law for man's will and conduct. The natural mind perceives the touch as of Deity; and recognizes the authority as divine. Mythology acknowledges the close connection between the well-being of men and their moral conduct, as also between their conduct and the authority, the will and the power of the gods. The light of conscience is in principle, divine light.

So Holy Scripture regards pagan morality. As Scripture acknowledges the validity of the native intuition of God, so does it acknowledge the divine element in the conscience. The conscience expresses not the intuitive perceptions of man only, but in its decisions utters the voice of God. Such is in substance the doctrine of the Apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Romans. Though the heathen have not, like the Jew, the ethical benefit of the decalogue and the ceremonial law; yet as the Apostle teaches, they do by nature the things contained in the law, and are a law unto themselves, and show the work of the revealed law written in their hearts. The law written by the finger of God on tables of stone, is by Him traced likewise in tables of flesh; and the conscience of the benighted pagan, like the conscience of the more highly favored Jew, bears witness perpetually to the presence of God, and the authority of His will, his thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another.*

But the law of God written in the heart is not regarded by Holy Scripture as being for itself final authority or the criterion of Christian virtue. The light of the conscience is veritable light, but inadequate to the necessities of mankind, and not commensurate with God's will as uttered in the Old and New Testament. Whilst Scripture recognizes and approves the moral light shining in the social and civil life of this world, it does not reflect nor radiate that light. The Bible is not merely a moral code. The first and main purpose of messianic revelation is not to teach the principles of true morality;

* Rom. 2: 13—15.

though true morality is inseparable from true religion. Scripture connects morality with religion, uniting the two as integral parts of one whole ; but the religion of the Bible imparts its own distinctive vitality to every moral precept. Hence the resemblance of pagan morality to the morality of Scripture is external rather than internal, and apparent more than real. Even such moral precepts as are expressed by nearly the same words in paganism and in Christianity differ in principle and motive. The former proceed from the conscience and are ruled by the power of the moral life of fallen human nature, whilst the latter grow from the faith of Christ working by love. The two moralities differ as much in spirit as the religion of Scripture differs from other religions. Pagan virtues are indeed more than "splendid vices." They may be genuine virtues, that is, virtues animated by the natural conscience, and approved by the moral judgment. But such virtue is not Christian ; and for the evident reason that it lacks the Christian principle. According to the Old Testament, righteousness grows from the covenant-communion of love with Jehovah. According to the New Testament moral purity and Christian holiness grow forth from the living communion of love with Jesus Christ glorified. Christian virtues are fruits of the Holy Spirit.

The moral light of Scripture differs thus in kind from the moral light of the pagan conscience and pagan literature. The latter needs the former. The feeble eye of the natural conscience seeks for more light ; and is capable of taking in the light of the moral law radiant in the Word of God ; the natural man may thus be led forth from the darkness and bondage of sin into the purer and brighter light of Christian freedom. But the purer light of God's word derives its purity and brightness from the new kingdom of spiritual life of which Jesus Christ is the Head. The morality taught by Scripture evidences itself to the eye of the natural conscience as the true light ; but the conscience does not illumine Scripture.

4. The light of Holy Scripture is not the light of natural religion.

Men are by nature as truly religious as they are moral and intellectual. The life of humanity is rooted in communion with Deity. The heart discerns the presence of the supreme Being active in nature and in the human constitution. Hence there is among all nations a perception and an idea of God. We might even say that men by nature have a knowledge of things spiritual and divine. The heart recognizes the presence of a supreme Power as authority for volition and action. The Divine is seen to be law for the human. But neither the intuition of a supreme Power nor the acknowledgment of superhuman authority for the conscience, constitutes natural religion. The religious life includes the perception of God, and respect for God's authority : but itself is other than either one or both combined.

Religion is the communion of God with man, of man with God. 'Created in the image of God, man is made for fellowship with Him. The fellowship is reciprocal. God is the joy of man. Man is the companion of God. Hence man is God's delight ; and God is the necessity and the portion of man. According to Scripture such is the original relation between God and man. This relation, notwithstanding the fact of the fall and the law of sin, is still the central, vital force in human nature, binding man to God by a bond deeper and stronger than volition or knowledge, or national custom, or tradition. This fellowship of man with God shows itself in worship, including prayers and sacrifices, temples, a priesthood, and the numerous rites and ceremonies of pagan cultus. The fellowship of God with man shows itself in the necessity of piety and devotion, a necessity which is universally felt, and felt more profoundly than language can express. It shows itself also in the universal belief that God hears the prayers of men, and rewards their fidelity to His service.

Whilst Holy Scripture professes to teach the only true religion and aims at turning men from false beliefs to the faith of Jesus Christ, Scripture nevertheless recognizes natural religion. It is not an empty notion, though many beliefs are

superstitions. Nor is ethnic religion merely a delusion, though many ideas respecting God and the spiritual world are false, and many rites of worship, degrading and monstrous. The fellowship of God with man in his misery is vital, and the response of man to God is from the heart.

The full equivalent of this view of natural religion St. Paul teaches in his address to the Athenians when he stood in the midst of Mars' hill. The Athenians were not given to a worship wholly delusive, but in their religious devotion there was error and excess. In rearing an altar to the unknown God they did not render homage to an idle fancy. The unknown God was the true God, but, to them, not known as the true God. "Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you. God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshiped with men's hands as though He needed anything, seeing He giveth to all, life and breath, and all things. And hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitations; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him, though He be not far from every one of us; for in Him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said; for we are also His offspring; forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device. And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent."* This address of the Apostle to the Athenian Areopagus is from beginning to end a reproof and a rebuke of the spiritual ignorance and the idolatry of the Athenian people; yet the discourse proceeds on the presumption that the Athenians are really religious, that the Object of their devotion is truly divine, and that the Deity has actually been bearing witness of Himself in nature, in their consciences

* Acts 17: 22-31.

and in their religious experience. They have not been left to themselves. God is giving them life and breath, and all things. He has not been far from them. Indeed in God they are living, and moving, and having their being. God has been nigh them and showing Himself to them, if haply they might feel after Him. But they have mistaken the intimations of His presence, and have perverted the gifts of His goodness. They have erred in thinking that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone graven by art and man's device. Inasmuch as men are the offspring of God, a truth discerned even by one of their own poets, such ignorance and errors are degrading and unworthy of the Athenians. Whilst in times past God winked at their ignorance, He now calls on them as on all men everywhere to repent

Evidently the force of the Apostle's discourse turns on the presumption of an intimate fellowship between God and men, which fellowship they had misinterpreted and degraded by their superstition and idolatry. God had been showing them divine truth, and it was manifest in them; but they had been holding the truth in unrighteousness. Now they were called upon to turn from their unrighteousness to Jesus Christ, the true and only Saviour of all men; and the obligation to repentance St. Paul enforces by declaring that God had appointed a day in the which He will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom He hath ordained; whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead.

The same doctrine respecting ethnic religions is explicitly taught or plainly implied in other passages of Holy Scripture. But we forbear further quotations. Indeed the teachings of the Old and the New Testament proceed throughout on the presupposition that there is in the nature and intuitions of mankind a moral and religious basis, a moral and religious necessity, for the revelation of God in Jesus Christ.

According to Scripture the spiritual darkness of our race, is great but not total and absolute.* Rays of the light of true

*Isa. 60: 2.

religion have from the creation of the world been penetrating the spiritual darkness.* The light shining in pagan religions is verily light, the radiance of divine truth; yet the light shining in Scripture is other than that. Scripture assumes that there is in pagan consciousness a degree of illumination from the heavenly realm, and hence from all nations challenges cordial response, but Scripture does not borrow from that illumination. Scripture shines by virtue of a light effulgent in itself alone.

Nor does Scripture profess to be composed partly of supernatural religious truth and partly of natural religious truth. Whatever of divine truth there is in ethnic religions Christianity acknowledges and addresses. But that truth Christianity has in itself, independently of pagan intuitions and pagan worship. To the truths of natural religion, moreover, the observation is applicable which was made regarding the sentiments and precepts common to pagan and Christian morality. Truths in some respects common to Christianity and the religions of the world are, nevertheless, not the same. The existence of God, for example, is one thing in all ethnic religions, and a very different thing in the religion of Scripture. Among pagans the belief in Deity is pantheistic, or dualistic, or deistic; and whichever of these forms religion may assume, it is not belief in one God only, but in all cases passes into the belief and worship of many gods. Scripture, on the contrary, whilst it presumes that all nations believe in the existence of Deity, excludes the errors of pantheism, and of dualism, and deism. Asserting the radical elements of truth contained in these false pagan beliefs, Scripture teaches the Divine to be one God—the absolute One who is the Personal and Holy and gracious God, transcendent and immanent. He is the Author, Ruler, and Upholder of all worlds, and yet truly present in all things. This one personal God is in the preliminary economy of the Old Testament, the covenant Jehovah of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and in the complementary spiritual economy of the New

* Rom. 1: 19, 20.

Testament He is the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Instead of borrowing or appropriating any conceptions of Deity from natural religions, Scripture illumines those religions by shedding on them the light of final truth. From pantheism reason reacts to deism, again from deism to pantheism; or, satisfied neither by pantheism nor deism, reaction may carry thought to the opposite extreme of atheism. The light of Scripture qualifies men to reject the errors of pagan beliefs, and grasp the radical truths that underlie gross superstitions and false philosophies.

Contrasted with pagan beliefs and with systems and ceremonies of pagan worship, Christianity is a new religion. The heavenly light shining in Holy Scripture cannot therefore be seen in any truth, however great and important it may be, radiating from world-religions, but may be seen only through the illumination of this heavenly light itself. The pagan devotee has an eye for the light of absolute truth; his eye is indeed feeble and diseased, and he may see men as trees walking; but his spiritual eye is not lifeless. The light which is in him is not total darkness. That he has a spiritual eye, weak and diseased though it be, an eye capable of discriminating somewhat, when touched by its heavenly beams, between the light of Christian revelation and the gross darkness which covers an apostate world, Holy Scripture recognizes. This, but no more. As the conscience of the pagan may be challenged by the authority of the moral law written in God's words, so by the Spirit may his soul be addressed and attracted to the fellowship of love with God revealed in Jesus Christ.

The light of Deity shines in the kingdoms of nature, in systems of philosophy, in the common conscience, and in world-religions. Nature has a spirit, philosophies have ideas, the common conscience utters a super-human judicial authority, and the religions of the world reveal instincts and intuitions, which presuppose the agency of One other than natural law and the con-

science, other than metaphysical hypotheses and ceremonies of worship. That One immanent in the cosmos and in man, active in physical forces and vocal in the conscience, confronting intuitive perception and addressing the heart, stimulating and perpetually nourishing divine beliefs and spiritual devotions,—that One manifests the invisible things of Himself to all races and all nations, even His eternal power and Godhead.

This supernal light penetrates every stratum and energizes the normal functions of the social and civil economy of non-Christian nationalities. To their social and civil organization this light imparts whatever of spiritual strength, of moral dignity, and religious vitality we may see at any stage of their history. Though inadequate to their needs, such light is precious. It is good—a moral and spiritual good. Scripture acknowledges it, approves it; and Christian theology cannot consistently close her eye to its supreme value; supreme, compared with all other facts, forces and phenomena of paganism. So much we not only concede, but emphasize. Far from disregarding or ignoring the seeds of divine truth germinant in the fallen life of our race, Scripture presumes both the existence and the superhuman origin of such truth.

Yet Holy Scripture does not derive its light from any natural or human source; neither from divine spirit breathing in external nature, nor from intimations of divine authority given by the conscience, neither from the spiritual wisdom of philosophy nor from the religious institutions of paganism. Between the two, the light of Scripture and the light shining in human history, there is indeed a species of sympathy, but it is like the co-relation between the glory of the natural sun and a weak bodily eye. The light shining in Scripture is peculiar to Scripture. It emanates from the heavenly realm to which Scripture is wedded; and tolerates no complementation by any other light, whether scientific or philosophical, moral or religious.

What is this divine light radiating from the written Word of God?

IV.

WHY DO CHRISTIANS DIE?

BY REV. J. A. DE BAUN, D.D.

THE question is very difficult. The death of the body is a part of the curse of the law—the penalty of sin. And sin is the *only* cause of death. Milton was entirely scriptural when he sang of the disobedience which “Brought death into the world, and all our woe.” Death came by sin, and no other possible reason why is—reasonably—even to be conjectured.

Not, indeed, in all cases *personal* sin. Through some vital union with the fates of sinning men brute creatures die though by their utter lack of moral nature, they are incapable of sin. And infants die, though they have never known good or evil. And the one death of all deaths, which convulsed nature and shocked the universe, was the death of One who, both in nature and in person, knew no sin. But the infant of an hour is the corrupt offspring of a corrupt race, and the great Son of God voluntarily linked His fate with those who, because of sin, were doomed to die.

With the broadest vision and the most careful consideration it remains true that death came by sin: in its essential nature it is the penalty of the law. We may reverently say that the God who made all things, and established all order, invented death as the judicial consequence of transgression.

But Christians are redeemed from the curse of the law. By a special provision of grace the penalty which they have incurred is borne by Another in their stead. There is now therefore no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus. He bore their sins in His own body on the tree, and there and then He died their death. So they are freed from that in which they

were held, and for them life and immortality are brought to light in the gospel. That *is* the gospel. And *yet* Christians die. It is no explanation to call the dissolution of the body by some other name. It is true that the separation of soul and body is not the whole of death, but it is *death*. We may poetically say,

"It is not death to die;"

we may gather sweetness out of precious scriptural words, and speak of "falling on sleep;" we may find real and great consolation in regarding the event as a "departure to be with Christ;" but still it is *death*. With heavy hearts we have watched the increasing failure of the powers of life through long, weary, painful months and years in those whom we loved and Christ; loved with unspeakable sympathy and agony we have hung ministering over the beds where they lay groaning with the pangs of dissolution; we have witnessed when we could not bear to witness the throes of mortal conflict until all the struggling energies succumbed, and with a sob of half relief and all grief we have said, and rightly said, "he is dead." Even Jesus said plainly, "Lazarus is dead."

Why do Christians die? Since Jesus died for them, how can they die?

It will not do to say that He died for our souls, but not for our bodies. He died for us, body and soul. There was nothing in Him of that perverted asceticism which counts the body nothing worth, and looks with contempt upon flesh and blood. Not only did He *make* the body, but as to our fleshly nature He also Himself took part in the same, and He gave His body for our bodies that he might redeem our flesh unto God. When He cometh He will bring, not disembodied spirits, but His resurrected and completed saints; and so shall we be—we, body, soul and spirit, all that constitutes ourselves—forever with the Lord. The fact that He took His own body to heaven is our warrant for His redeeming love for our bodies too.

Why, then, do Christians die? The question is by no means new. In all generations it has confronted thoughtful students

of the Holy Word, and those who have been set for the defense of the gospel: and the answers have been, perhaps, even more various than the several philosophic schemes of general interpretation and formulated creeds. Moreover, in some cases the slightness—the utter unsatisfactoriness—of the solution, and in others the wavering double-mindedness of the answer given, plainly shows that this question has not attained a self-evident understanding even by the light of eighteen hundred years of consideration.

We quote such opinions as we have been able to gather from standard authors who, in this matter, seem to deserve a hearing.

1. *Whitby*, in his commentary, quotes *Irenæus* as follows: (we have not been able to verify the quotation because of some mistake in the reference):—"Now the reason why, after our freedom from condemnation by the death of Christ, our bodies are still subject to death, is thus assigned by the fathers: 'Because, should we have lived forever in this imperfect state, we should have sinned forever,' and therefore 'God permits good men still to die that sin might not live forever in them; doing this not out of His displeasure to punish them for sin, but out of mercy to free them from it.'"

But in this explanation there are two evident fallacies: first, the assumption that if we lived forever we must live forever in this imperfect state; and second, that sin is killed by death—that we are saved from sin by dying. It is not our dying, but the dying of the Lord Jesus, that saves His people from their sins.

2. *Calvin*, in his commentary on Rom. viii. 10, says: "He, (Paul), anticipates here an occasion of doubt, which might have otherwise disturbed us; for though the Spirit possesses a part of us, we yet see another part still under the power of death. He then gives this answer—that the power of quickening is in the Spirit of Christ, which will be effectual in swallowing up our mortality. He hence concludes that we must patiently wait until the relics of sin be entirely abolished The

word 'body' signifies that gross mass which is not yet purified by the Spirit of God from earthly dregs, which delights in nothing but what is gross; for it would be otherwise absurd to ascribe to the body the fault of sin; besides, the soul is so far from being life that it does not of itself live."

The idea seems to be that the body is so gross that there is nothing to do with it but first to kill it, and we must patiently wait that process before its redemption.

If indeed that were the only way of getting out of the flesh the grossness which sin has wrought, then welcome temporal death! But it seems to us that, rightly considered, sin has wrought quite as much grossness in the soul as in the body: indeed that grossness is more essentially spiritual than carnal, and that it is quite as persistent and ingrained in the immaterial as in the material part of us; in short, that it is a crude and gross conception which limits or especially attributes grossness to matter. Consequently, if the way to get the relics of sin out of the body is by means of death, then is not that also the way to get the relics of sin out of the soul; and must there not be spiritual death as well as temporal death before there can be deliverance?

But further, is there not a doctrinal fallacy in making death the Saviour, even of the body, if only from the relics of sin?

If we have at all rightly understood Calvin, his explanation seems to us full of the asceticism which pours contempt upon the body beyond its comparative merit, and sees an unwarranted necessity for the mortification of the flesh. And it is not like Calvin to let death, nor life, nor any other creature separate him from Christ Jesus our Lord as the only Saviour even of a despicable body, though it were only from the relics of sin.

3. *Gill*, in his commentary on Rom. viii. 10, says, "This fleshly body, because liable to afflictions, which are called deaths, has the seeds of mortality in it, and shall in a little time die, notwithstanding the gift of it to Christ, though it is redeemed by His blood, and united to Him. The reason of it

is not merely the decree of God, nor does it arise from the original constitution of the body ; but sin is the true reason of it—sin original and actual, indwelling sin ; but not by way of punishment for it, for Christ has borne that : death is one of the saints' privileges ; it is for their good, and therefore desired by them, that they might be rid of it, and freed from all the troubles which are the consequents of it."

This is intended to be, and seems to be, very carefully guarded from any ascription to death of the office of the Lord Jesus as Saviour ; and yet it makes death the Lord's way of deliverance for His people from the consequents of sin. And that is a doctrinally unsound position : we say so not for doctrines' sake, but for the honor of our Lord Jesus Christ, whose way of saving His people from their sins and the consequents is not by their death but by His own. And He does it all Himself, and does not require our death even to finish up His work.

4. *Haldane*, in his commentary on Rom. viii. 10, gives the following beautiful, but complicated and not altogether consistent explanation : " Such a death "—the death of a Christian—" is not a punishment of sin, or a curse of the law. Its end and use to the regenerate, as to their bodies, is to extirpate and destroy the sin that remains in them ; they must die in order to be purified. The infusion of that moral poison has so corrupted our bodies that like the leprous house, they must be taken down and renewed to be purified from sin. As the grain is not quickened except it die, in the same way our bodies die and moulder in the dust, to be revived and reconstructed in holiness. If it be said that God, without dooming His people to die, could have changed them in a moment, as He will do with respect to those who shall survive to the day of His coming, it should be considered that the wisdom of God hath judged it proper that the believer should be subjected to the death of the body. This tends to lead him to hold sin in abhorrence whence death proceeds. He also sees in death the goodness and severity of God, and by it and his other afflictions he may judge what will

be the end of those whom God punishes in anger. He may observe in it the goodness of God to him in depriving it of its sting, and ordering it so that he may more fully taste the sweetness of a lasting and immortal life. Such discipline, too, tends to humble the believer, by which also his graces, given to him by God, are increased, and the power of the Lord made manifest in his weakness. Finally, believers die that in their death they may be conformed to Jesus Christ; for if He died shall they, who are His members, be exempt from this lot? And if He must in that way enter into His glory, shall they who are His members enter by another way? And this assuredly is a great consolation, that in dying we follow Jesus Christ, our Head, who hath gone before us The nature of death is changed to believers by Jesus Christ, so that the 'day of their death is better than the day of their birth.' Death to them is no more a curse, but a blessing, which puts an end to their sins and troubles, causing them to pass to perfect holiness and happiness, and from being absent from the Lord to carry them into His presence in Paradise. From being strangers on the earth, it introduces them into their heavenly inheritance. . . . If the children of Israel, when they arrived at the river Jordan, were dismayed at the overflowing of its waters, had they not reason to rejoice when they beheld on the other side that fertile land which God had promised them, and into which they were about to enter to enjoy its fruits? But above all, had they not cause of encouragement, when they saw the Ark of the Covenant was in the midst of Jordan? Death is the passage of Jordan by which believers enter the heavenly Canaan. In order that its waves may not overwhelm them in passing, Jesus Christ arrests them, since He is in His people, and consequently with them.'

This homily is Haldane all over—beautiful with piety, practical out of a personal experience of divine grace, straightforward in the exhibition of common sense, and giving supreme honor to the Lord Jesus Christ, our only Head and Saviour. We hate to touch it with a dissecting hand, lest we spoil its perfume for some dear mortal child of God. But our office

just now is to look for the heart of the truth as to the necessity for the Christian's death; has Haldane shown it here? His analysis is easy, but confusing, too. (1.) "The end and use of death, to the regenerate, is to extirpate and destroy the sin that remains in them,—they must die in order to be purified"—this is not consistent with Haldane's theology, nor with ours. It is the blood of Jesus Christ that cleanseth from *all* sin; and He gives the victory—we do not die for it. (2.) "Our bodies die and moulder in the dust to be revived and reconstructed in holiness." But could not the Lord purify the body without the grave, as well as the soul without hell? (3.) The believer by his own death may judge what will be the end of those whom God punishes in anger. Perhaps we had better let that go without comment. (4.) "By death the believer may more fully taste the sweetness of a lasting and immortal life." Yes, that may be an incidental benefit of death, but not a reason why. And we would say the same of (5.)—"the discipline of death tends to humble the believer, and increase his graces and to manifest the power of God in his weakness."

(6.) "Believers die that they may be conformed to Jesus Christ. If He must in that way enter into His glory shall they who are His members enter by another way?" But if He died for them, then why must they themselves die? That is just the question in hand; and surely, it will not do to say that inasmuch as Christ has died in our stead, *therefore* we must nevertheless die.

(7.) "Death to believers is no more a curse, but a blessing which carries them into the presence of the Lord in Paradise." Yes, blessed be His holy name! But why *death* to carry them—the pain, and the shame, and the darkness of it, rather than the translation-glory which would be quite as possible with God?

5. *Godet* meets the question thus: "From Rom. v. 12, 15, 17, we know the Apostle's view respecting the cause of death: 'Through one man's offense *many* are dead.' The fact of universal death does not, therefore, arise from the sins of individuals, but from the original transgression. The meaning of these words:

because of sin, is thus fixed: they refer to Adam's sin. It is sometimes asked why believers still die, if Christ really died for them, and an argument is drawn hence against the doctrine of expiation. But it is forgotten that, death not being an individual punishment, there is no connection between this fact and the pardon of sins granted to believing individuals. Death, as a judgment on humanity, bearing on the *species* as such, remains till the general consummation of Christ's work; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 26. The term *dead* here signifies, irrevocably smitten with death. The human body bears within itself from its formation the germ of death: it begins to die the instant it begins to live. Commentators who like Chrysostom, Ebrard, Grotius, explain this term *dead* as *dead unto sin* (in a good sense), evidently do not understand the course of thought in these verses, (Rom. viii. 9-11). But if the believer's death cannot be prevented, there is a domain in him where life has already established its reign, *the spirit*, in which Christ dwells."

This exposition seems to us to be based upon a fundamental fallacy, in that it makes or presupposes an unwarranted distinction in the application of the three-fold penalty of the law—death, temporal, spiritual and eternal. Speaking of temporal death, Godet asserts that it is not an individual punishment, but a judgment on humanity, bearing on the species as such. But the penalty of the law is one; and if temporal death is a judgment on humanity, bearing on the species as such, so also is death spiritual and eternal. And in a sense that is true; but in no ordinary sense can death spiritual and eternal be understood otherwise than as an individual punishment, however superinduced by original sin and race depravity. The thunder of the law is personal—"the soul that sinneth it shall die." The sting of death is not race origin, but *sin*. On what principle can we sever temporal death from the one penalty of the law and set it aside as being because of Adam's sin, while we declare the rest of the penalty to be individual and personal? Must we not necessarily hold it true that in whatever sense and degree temporal death is the penalty of Adam's transgression,

of original sin, of race depravity, spiritual and eternal death are of precisely the same origin? But Godet make the distinction in the application of the three-fold penalty still more marked, if not more radical. Speaking of Rom. viii. 10, "The body is dead because of sin," he says, "the term *dead* here signifies, irrevocably smitten with death. The human body bears within itself from its formation the germ of death; it begins to die the instant it begins to live." But why is temporal death irrevocable, if death spiritual and eternal are remediable through the Lord Jesus Christ? He says, because the human body bears within itself from its formation the germ of death, and so the believer's death cannot be prevented. But is the body more sorely, more essentially, more radically, more vitally stricken with death, than the soul is? In short, is the penalty of the death of the body so peculiar a part of the one penalty of the law that it is inevitable and irrevocable, while the same penalty of the same law against the soul may be balanced and outweighed by a ransom?

The fact, of course, is unquestionable, that while the people of God inherit everlasting life, the death of their bodies stands unrevoked; but when we have read all that Godet says about it, we still ask, "Why do Christians die?"

6. Dr. Charles Hodge, in his commentary on Rom. viii. 10, explains as follows: "*The body indeed is dead—i. e. must die, is obnoxious to death, notwithstanding the indwelling of the life-giving Spirit, on account of sin.* Sin is the cause of all infirmities and sorrows, and finally, of the dissolution to which our bodies are subject in this world. This fact is inconsistent neither with our being in favor with God, nor with our being partakers of the life of Christ. This is evident from two considerations: First, our souls already participate in this life; and secondly, our bodies shall be raised up again, and share forever in that blessedness of which Christ is the Author." With the deepest respect for this Master in Israel we cannot help feeling that so far as our inquiry is concerned, his reasoning is inconsequen-

tial. Christians die on account of sin: how can that be, when Christ died for us? Is it an answer to say, first, that their souls live, and, secondly, that their bodies shall rise again? Nevertheless, *why do they die?*

7. Dr. A. A. Hodge quoted in Pott's *Golden Dawn*, page 150, much more profoundly says: "Justification changes the entire federal relation of its subject to the law, and raises him forever above all the penal consequences of sin. Death, therefore, while remaining a part of the penalty of the unsatisfied law in relation to the unjust, is like all other afflictions changed, in relation to the justified, into an element of improving discipline. It is made necessary for them from the present constitution of the body, while it is to both body and soul the gateway of heaven."

That death is to the Christian an element of improving discipline is unquestionably an incidental benefit, but just as evidently not a radical reason for its occurrence. And, indeed, Dr. Hodge does not so assign it, any more than the other incidental of death that it is the gateway of heaven; but finds necessity for death in the present constitution of the body." True enough: but when the Lord planned and executed Redemption to rescue His people, was the constitution of their bodies so inexorably fixed that they must die nevertheless? Two, already, He has changed and glorified, without their seeing death; none of those who remain when He comes again shall die, but shall be changed into glory in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. Why then do Christians die?

8. *Meyer* meets the question with a simple declaration: "Death, which has arisen and become general through the entrance of sin into the world, can be averted in no case, not even in that of the regenerate man." And again, "According to Rom. viii. 10, there was still left one power of death, that over the body." Surely he does not mean to intimate that it is beyond the power of God; and yet his "can be averted in no case" sounds like the knell of irresponsible and remorseless doom—a supreme fate. To the like purport,

9. *Whedon* simply says, without argument or attempted explanation: "The body is, in spite of regeneration, dead, in its unreversed destiny of mortality."

10. *Dr. Riddle*, in *Lange's Commentary*, on Rom. viii. 10, says: "The physical death of the body is to be viewed as a moral result of the indwelling sin, but only because the body has not yet shared in the full results of redemption." To this brief statement of doctrine on our topic we shall have occasion soon to recur.

In our search for the radical reason why Christians die, notwithstanding the death of their Substitute and Surety, it would be strange if we had not lighted upon incidental reasons, or at least incidental benefits accruing from the momentous fact. Such is the plenitude of the Divine wisdom that nothing that God does and nothing that God permits stands for one purpose alone. Many ends He accomplishes by every single movement of His finger—by every one of His thoughts. No one can even superficially observe the interlinkings of His Providence or the overlappings of His Word without coming to look instinctively for something more when we think we see a reason why. So, certainly, in this matter; whatever is the radical reason why, we may be sure that the Lord has many gracious benefits for His people in their continued subjection to physical death.

a) To a Christian the certainty of death is a *discipline*, keeping him humble, consciously dependent, and the more anxious for a strong hold upon the personal presence and almighty grace of his all-conquering Lord. A training discipline, too, by which he shall be nerved to meet with boldness the enemy before which all nature quails, and so at once both feel and show the sanctified courage which pertains to regenerated humanity. And yet further, the discipline of deepest trial, even unto death, shall make the life to come the sweeter when this last danger is overpast.

b) To the Christian, death is the occasion of *deliverance*, from the remaining troubles of sin, from pain, from sorrow, and from this present evil world.

c) The Christian's death is his gateway to heaven. Death does not save him; death does not take him there; but through death he enters in, led and held by Him who has conquered death, and led captivity captive.

d) For the Christian, the death of his body is the preliminary to reconstruction. Willingly, gladly, he will let it be sown a natural body, that it may be raised a spiritual body.

e) The death of the Christian is for the glory of God. His strength is made perfect in our weakness; never more manifestly than when heart and flesh fail us, and He has to see us through the crisis in which all other help helplessly stands still.

f) Christians die because God would not have men know positively in this world who are His. Not to dwell upon the thought—if only they died whom God rejects, how could the righteous bear the death of a friend? How could we who preach the gospel live and preach on, after the funeral of one of our flock? Surely, surely, for the comfort—for the *possibility* of living, I would rather die myself than to have only the lost die. But now for a radical answer to our question, Why do Christians die?

It seems to us that Dr. Riddle, as quoted above, has touched the essential point; though without the emphasis and amplification which it both needs and deserves: "The physical death of the body is to be viewed as a moral result of the indwelling sin, *but only because the body has not yet shared in the full results of redemption.*"

When our Lord Jesus Christ bore our sins in His own body on the tree, His work of atonement for all His people was fully accomplished. When He cried, "It is finished," and gave up the ghost, He had paid all the price, had fully satisfied for all our sins, and had entirely vindicated the Divine justice. There remained no more sacrifice to be offered; the chastisement of our peace had been laid upon Him, and He had died our death.

And yet His work of redemption was not entirely done. The end was indeed made sure; but results and consequents were

still to be wrought out, not only by the natural and necessary sequence of events, but by His own imminent working. He returned to His Father and to our Father—to His God and our God—not to sit yet in ultimate glory and eternal rest, but from His throne to finish His Mediatorial and Redemptive work: to be still our active Prophet, Priest, and King. For instance,

1. He is our Intercessor. He presents the case and pleads the cause of each one of His people before the throne of God. He ever liveth to make intercession for us. Now and ever, until we get safely home, "if any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." He has gone within the veil with His own blood, not to present Himself, but to represent us before the mercy-seat. The seventeenth chapter of St. John is, as it were, a pre-echo of the fulfillment of His office which goes on unceasingly as long as His people shall have need.

2. The Lord Jesus Christ is still *educating* His people by His word, by His Spirit, by His personal presence, by His direction of Providence, and by the means of grace to make ready a people prepared for the Lord, and to fit them for their inheritance. Long ago He redeemed them, every one; but in process of time and by the process of grace, He regenerates, converts, enlightens, and sanctifies; until He has fully fashioned them, a peculiar people and a royal nation. With each one of them all this is a work of His unfinished until—one by one—they are gathered into the joys of their Lord.

3. He still is gathering His other sheep, which are not yet of this fold. To this end He is with those who are preaching the gospel to every creature, at once working mightily and waiting patiently for individual souls, for the ends of the earth, and, we humbly trust, for many everywhere who are yet sitting in darkness.

4. He is building up His Church, the glorious temple, not yet finished, but whose walls are growing in strength and beauty, and will grow, under His hand, until the top-stone

shall be laid with shoutings of "grace, grace" unto it. Even now her walls are salvation and her bulwarks praise; but it doth not yet appear what she shall be when her King shall enter in. But then,

5. He is coming for His own.

The day shall be when the same Jesus after whose ascending form His disciples gazed steadfastly into heaven shall come again in power and glory—come to gather His elect from the four winds, from the one end under heaven to the other. Then shall come to pass that which He hath promised. "I will come again and receive you unto Myself, that where I am there may ye be also." Then all that are in the graves shall hear His voice and come forth: the dead small and great shall stand before God; the sea shall give up the dead which are in it, and death and hell shall deliver up the dead which are in them; and He shall sever the wicked from among the just; and so shall we go to be forever with the Lord.

"Then cometh the end, when He shall have delivered up the Kingdom to God, even the Father, when He shall have put down all rule, and all authority and all power. For He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet. *The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.*"

For that culmination we have been hastily sketching the resulting and consequent work of redemption which is still going on, and which is yet to come. The last thing which our Redeemer shall do for His people, before He finally sits down with them in the Kingdom of His Father, is *to destroy death*. To be the death of death.

Until then death reigns in our mortal bodies, even as death has reigned ever since sin brought him into the world. Death reigns, notwithstanding the great Redemption and the great Salvation, because our Redeemer has not yet finished His work. He has taken away the sting of death, and victory from the grave. For His disciples He has emptied death, and made it only a form and shadow of what it was,—albeit a form grim and dreadful. He has made His people to triumph

even *in* dying, and has given them substantial and actual and abiding victory, though still they fall. Cast down but not destroyed they are, because even in their seeming defeat He hath led captivity captive. Death has a poor show of triumph when it shakes down the earthly house of this tabernacle, only to let the redeemed prisoner go free in that very act, and the fighting pilgrim even thereby to become victorious conqueror; but what shall we say of death when it shall be compelled to yield up its poor prey glorified and immortal? Nay, what shall we say of death when all these things shall be finished by the utter and final destruction of death, after the last scrap that death has taken shall be wrested away and made glorious in the light of God!

Why do Christians die? Because we are still in the midst of the process of redemption, and our Lord has not yet slain that one last enemy—death. He hath severed his sting. He hath left to him only a barren triumph; and soon, when He cometh, He shall be the death of death, and there shall be no more death.

Even so, come Lord Jesus, yea, come quickly!

V.

ETERNAL LIFE AND ETERNAL DEATH.

BY REV. C. Z. WEISER, D. D.

I.—*What is Life?*

WHOEVER professes to write a treatise on Life, with the faintest pretense of telling its *principium essendi*, must expect to be regarded very youthful, quite inexperienced, and "a gentleman of great leisure." After a fruitless search for the "Elixir of Life," stretching over six thousand years, the conviction has firmly settled itself, that this is one of the riddles which mankind is not to solve. It must not be supposed, however, that by casting aside such an essay, or by the ignoring of all philosophical or theological discussions, all inquiry and controversy will cease, concerning the theme. Man cannot so readily and finally exanmiat himself of all concern about the substance, which constitutes his vitality, or essential being, try as he may. The contemptuous sneer of Pontius Pilate has not at all stayed the endeavor to answer the question: *What is truth?*

The *Materia Prima* of all things, or the substance of individual existence even, must be referred to the unwritten volume of "Things Unknown and Unknowable." Man is wholly ignorant of the essence of things; of matter; of the material part of objects around himself; of the *stamina* of his own physical and spiritual being. Its mysterious quality evades his eye; and evades his eye, whether under the microscope or telescope, too. He cannot tell what the substance of wood is, of iron, or of bread; of the simplest bodies, indeed.

But all this being so, the *phenomena* of life are not so absolutely hid from the human ken. The chief characteristics of this subtle and mysterious element of vitality have been clearly

defined. What had been thought to be wholly undefinable, in view of its vast range, stretching from the simplest cell, to the complex vital essence of man, has been formulated to no small degree of satisfaction. Instead of shrinking from rendering a definition, lest it might prove too wide, and so too vague, or, not yet wide enough to embrace all its manifestations, Mr. Spencer, among the rest, has gained a scientific triumph, when he declared life to be the mystic power in the creature, by which "the internal relations are continually adjusted to its external relations." In other words, "the distinctive characteristic of life, is, its spontaneous power of reacting on the surroundings, by which it is ever acted upon." An example, by which the inanimate object is contrasted with the animate creature, will prove the accuracy of this definition.

A stone is said to be "dead," for the reason, that it cannot react on its various surroundings, air, water, cold and heat. It is a thing wholly passive, "the creature of circumstances" emphatically. And throughout the entire mineral sphere of creation, this holds severely true. But the moment the mystic line is crossed, which separates the inanimate realm, from the vegetable kingdom, the law "of action and reaction" is found in force. A plant is a "living" creature, because it can react, as well as be acted on, by its surroundings. It is not "the sport of the elements," though it be subject to them too. It has "something to say," indeed, to the constant challenges which wind and weather cast down at its feet. It responds truly, by assimilating and appropriating the material which its environments bring to its door, and may be said to be "master of its circumstances." This prerogative is enjoyed by the simplest cell, whilst it is denied to the stalagmite and stalactite, or the grandest crystal and most costly pearl. In the animal order of life, this marvellous kind of double action is on exhibition, in a still higher degree, and on a broader plane. Here the cycle of "giving and taking" is vastly enlarged. And best of all, do we discern this two-fold working in the human sphere. Man is the most living creature of all terrestrial

beings. But this is not so, simply because he stands within a larger circle of environment; it is in consequence of his emphatically reigning over a wider empire. Whilst man is acted upon by many more surroundings, he reacts too in very many more ways on his circumstances. His will-power is the measure of his life. And for this it is, that the Roman calls him "Vir" (strength).

Whilst, then, no definition of life proves absolutely satisfactory, we still do not see the propriety of stigmatizing the efforts of the prudent scientists, as silly or deserving of sneers. The chief characteristics of life, as brought to the surface and formulated by the chief priests who minister at the altars of science, are worthy of all respect. When they tell us, that life's trinity of phenomena are: a) That it feeds itself; b) That it responds to stimuli; c) That it possesses the power of reproducing its kind: we feel that facts are laid at our door, which may be verified to the full, whether we can or cannot, with so much discovered, cross the bridge which spans the gulf that yawns between life and feeling, and between feeling and thought. And if the progress of science has done nothing of more importance, than to deepen the distinction between the mysterious power of life, as such, and its phenomena, it has still done much, whereof we are glad.

II.—*Eternal Life and Eternal Death.*

It is not hard to tell, then, why the pregnant adjective "Eternal" should ever continue to shroud itself in a perplexing haze, all though the perspective of human thought, until

The finished city to the view
Its vistas opens and its streets of gold;

or, why Eternity should sit as a sphinx, wearing the winning face of a woman on the forbidding body of a lion, to all the sons of Time, who would draw near, to explore its mysterious realm, without the torch of Him "who brought life and immortality to light." Man is not capable of conceiving, much less

of determining, the nature of an object of thought or being, even though it lay within the environment of his own existence, unless he holds in hand some rule of adjustment, whereby he may weigh, measure, or estimate it. He must adopt a "standard of comparison." Length, breadth, height, depth, distance; let it be anything of quality or quantity, of whatsoever kind, it must remain wholly unintelligible to us, save as we can apply the several *Norms*, everywhere admitted as fixed and determinative. It is by virtue of such "standards" that we are enabled to increase our relative knowledge of all the categories which are homogeneous with our present order of being. By a chronometer, for example, we learn to know the rapidity or lethargy of the human pulse, as well as the velocity of the planet's flight. With so small a pocket-instrument, we may measure the mathematics of the universe "in the hollow of the hand," as it were. Man were utterly lost in his knowledge of time, should he become isolated from the vast clock-work of the solar system:—from the annual alternations of the seasons, of the revolutions of day and night, of the stately swing of the pendulum, of the beat of his heart, the heave of his chest, of the regular return of the sensations of hunger and fulness, or of labor and rest.

The difference between a long and a short period of duration, could then be discerned only, it may be, by the quick or slow gait of thought or feeling, through the avenues of his mind. And as these move, sometimes in a fitful way, and then with elephantine tread, there could be no way by which to tell, whether these had been a century on the march, or but an hour. "A thousand years were as one day, and one day as a thousand years." Two men, let it be supposed, of unequal mental or emotional experiences, during a given period, might then speak of the same interval, the one regarding it as an Eon, whilst the other would think of it but as a "yesterday when it is past."

The thick array of promiscuous forms and images, which move across our mental theatres, in a dream, affords us the best and most vivid conception of what one's inner machinery would

perform, were we once cut loose from the horology of time. Such opposite and contrary illusions of duration we might expect to rise to the surface of our spiritual constitution; living in the same house, indeed, and passing through the same ordeals were there not at hand some fixed and sure Norm, by which all that occurs is correctly dated.

Our position becomes all the more firm, as soon as we attempt to cross the horizon of time and would explore the realm beyond and above it. To creatures of a lower domain, the higher one supervening must ever and naturally seem a profound mystery. The mineral order, were there a mind at hand, could not discern the conditions of the vegetable kingdom. The eloquence of a rose might speak never so loud, to the grandest crystal, and still it were all lost to the latter. The most gorgeous pearl could not perceive the nature of a cell of the simplest form of life. Nor could the mammoth tree, no more than the lowliest shrub, in the faintest degree, realize the construction of the Ephemera that sport in the sunbeam. Not even can the caterpillar, that trails over the clods, apprehend at all its own waiting state of the butterfly, ere it is born into it. And, in a larger and far more extended sense, may we say, that the human order must seem to the noblest species of the brute kind a riddle.

Whatever other hindrances may stand in the way of clear vision, in the lower kind, to apprehend and understand the nature of the next higher creatures, as well as their environments, we may safely assume the total absence of rightful Norms, by which to compare the unknown to the known, to be the greatest one. Given a "standard of comparison" once, the first round in the ladder is fixed, on which we may conceive the possibility of an ascension, too. It may be that the want of such a Norm is the fact which constitutes the great gulf between the living and the dead, and renders it an impossibility for the departed to "manifest" themselves, even to their nearest and dearest friends, who are still in the lower sphere of flesh and blood. It was not until God had revealed Himself through

the Incarnation of His Son, and a "body" had been prepared, which became glorified through the mysterious processes of death, resurrection and ascension, that the Father could be seen by the soul and spirit of man. This "body" is now the common medium between God and man. But as the "spiritual bodies" of the saints are not yet matured to such a sublime stage as that of Christ is, there is no means of fellowship, as yet, between the saints on earth and those in glory. What medium those have who have emerged out of the mortal state, and are fully born into the heavenly state, if they possess any, we cannot tell. But, sure it is, that such a Norm is wanting to the sons of time.

Hence, a mysterious gloaming must envelop the realm of eternity for the eye of all finite creatures. And a twilight vision, if even so much as that, betrays itself in every definition which mortals have ventured to formulate concerning it. What is supposed to be the popular view of eternity assumes *Time* to be the rightful Norm, by which to approximate and measure it. "Eternity is an economy without beginning and without end," we are told. We need but extend *Time* both ways to Infinity, it is thought, to have eternity before the soul's eye. Though it is written that "Time shall be no longer," the temporal realm is ever at hand, to compare the non-temporal with. We vividly remember, how a prominent divine endeavored to portray eternity for us, by challenging us to imagine a mountain of sand, from which a solitary bird was to bear off grain by grain, at an interval of a million of years, until the mountain had been carried clean away by so slow-going a process. But even then, those countless Eons, we were told, all in one, were but, aside of eternity, as a drop to the ocean. The preacher, it is plain to us now, intended to manufacture a *Time*-made eternity. He had but to clip *Time* at both ends, by cutting off "without beginning" and "without end," to present the limitless enconomy.

It is thought that this is the view which the masses entertain of eternity. But the commonness of an idea is not a proof of

its popularity. It may spring glibly from the lips and tongues of the people, and yet be many removes from the great heart of humanity. Aside of the Proverbs, which sound so racy and alive with the fresh and warm juice of the tree of mankind, they betray their foreign origin and genius at once. Ideas are too often yclept "popular," which are not such, whether we trace them to their primary source or note the response which they call forth from the mind of the crowd. They may have been in-drilled so hard as to appear in-grained; and still be found too artificial to have sprung from so natural a fountain.

This position may be securely held, in reference to the subject immediately in hand. It is Mr. Spencer, and not the populace, who writes:—"The eternity we ascribe to God is time multiplied to infinity; but we cannot conceive time multiplied to infinity; therefore, we cannot conceive a God who has existed from all eternity."

Mr. Douglas, in *The American Church Review* for March, 1883, answers: "God exists altogether apart from what we call time. The eternity of God is no more time raised to infinity, than the love of God is human love raised to infinity. Time implies change, and God cannot change. Time implies succession, and in God there is no succession of months or days or years. Time implies movement, and God, while His existence is one of intense activity, is at the same time one of most perfect repose. In time there is past, present and future; and for God there is no past, no present, no future. Time is the measure of the existence of created things: it varies with their nature: even in ourselves it is affected not a little by the circumstances and the condition of our body and mind. To the sick man it passes slowly; to the joyous how quickly. Active employment lends it wings, and the dull monotony of enforced idleness makes it creep along more slowly than a snail. The measure of angelic existence, as St. Thomas tells us, differs altogether from the measure of human existence. The measure of our life in heaven will be very unlike the measure of our life on earth. Time, therefore, is something relative, not absolute;

and as in God all is absolute, Time has no meaning in respect of His existence. God does not exist in time—no, not in infinite time. He is above all time, and before all time, and beyond all time."

Let any one place both these formulations of thought, side by side, and say, which seems most like what an unsophisticated mind might advance, concerning the eternity of God, or eternity as such. From the sick chamber and from the bed-ridden woman, we might expect some such conception as the writer in the "Review" endeavors to formulate; whilst Mr. Spencer's theory smells of the midnight lamp. There is an intuitiveness about the orthodox thinking of eternity, which is not bound by mathematical lines, or logical limits, whilst the philosopher labors in a strait jacket. The raciness of the heart language is at once gone at the touch of logic, as the bloom of the peach is marred by the fingers of man. There is an acridness about the bottled perfumery of the apothecary, which is not discerned in the sweet effluvia of the meadow, or the garden. And that same wide distinction will be found to exist between the Word of God, which "is spirit and life," and the hard and dry words of science. They contrast as sharply as does the mellow apple, with its "evaporated" double.

An unsophisticated mind, or one not first school-taught, will hardly reach out for a Norm, such as time affords, by which to measure eternity. One well-taught in Scripture phraseology, will not fall on mere "endlessness," when confronted by the idea of an economy of which it is written, "Time shall be no longer." The language of God's Word, which is also the language of the popular heart in its soberest moods, does not suggest a parallelism between time and eternity. The positively and eminently spiritual element of the divine record, addressing itself immediately and solely to the like interior and ethical nature of man, must necessarily have, one would think, something more real than the ghost of never-endingness, whose chief characteristic is, that it is "without beginning and without end." This exponent, at best, offers but a purely negative

economy. It informs us of what that realm has *not*; but does not tell us of any of its positive elements, which necessarily enter into its fearfully solemn and profoundly essential constitution. The thought of a monotonous vacuity or cavernous emptiness, is not a Scriptural one, whether we look to its source or to its ingredients. As presented in the Gospel, on the one side, and as demanded by the soul of mankind on the other, eternity is something immeasurably more substantial than mere endlessness proffers. It were but an empty phantom, then; and all the more phantom-like, in proportion as it is rendered infinitely limitless. The more endless, the more vague and spectre-like, we may say. In the language of Scripture, however, as well as in the earnest craving of the human spirit, an economy of blissful contents, or grace elements, is constantly predicated, first and mainly. Mere endlessness, as such, conveys no satisfying ingredient. Extended existence, prolonged on and on, to infinity, both backward and forward, if we please, does yet not discover to us any substantial fruition for the spiritual nature of man, as any one must concede. There is no boon concealed in purely infinite existence. A finite existence may already prove a burden too heavy to be borne, as is alas! too often seen in the multiplying cases of suicides. The conviction, that the redeemed enjoy a far greater prerogative than a ceaseless being, lies too far within us, not to oblige us to take the adjective "Eternal" in a positive sense, first of all. It were hardly a prize sufficiently precious, let it be reverently spoken, for the obtaining of which, we are asked to sacrifice all that this life affords, were the goal at last but time multiplied to infinity. That men are ready to become martyrs for it, to attain to eternal life, or to escape eternal death, proves plainly enough, that "the hundred-fold" promised, or threatened, implies more than time "without beginning and without end."

It must be remembered too, that the term "Eternal," as signifying "without beginning and without end," cannot be applied to man, who ranks with the finite creatures. Man has

a "beginning," surely, and can, accordingly, not have an endlessness predicated of himself.

Nor is it as easy a matter to adapt the term to man's circumstances, as we are sometimes inclined to believe. We need but leave off "without beginning," it is thought, to render the adjective relevant. We hold, nevertheless, that it is an unwarranted liberty, to "play fast and loose" with the term so significant. To lay down a definition of "Eternal," in one line, as meaning "without beginning and without end," to abandon it in the next, in so far as to make it mean *with* a beginning, but "without end," is not to deal consistently, to say the least. A definition which does not cover the whole ground, is not "a scientific triumph." It is trifling with a term, to *affix*, merely to *curtail*, we think. No lexicographer would approve of such a procedure, as legitimate or logical, we may be sure. It becomes all the more evident, under this additional consideration, that time as a norm, by which to apprehend eternity, will ever prove faulty and bewildering; and, that the obligation becomes all the more pressing, to formulate a better standard of comparison; unless we are prepared to confess, that man cannot pretend to hope for any rule by which to gain any conception of "the undiscovered country."

It is the aim of these pages, indeed, to render the fact plain and striking, that every conception which man may originate and formulate concerning Eternity, concerning Eternal life and Eternal death, cannot but be defective and unsatisfactory. And the main argument on which we base this proposition is, that the lower orders of creatures are incompetent to apprehend, still more so, to comprehend the nature and environment of those beings which indwell the next higher, whether we limit our vision to the horizon of time, or penetrate beyond it.

It remains for us further to inquire whether *Revelation* does not bring to our hand a standard, by which eternity can be conceived of and consistently cherished, in a way that is both consistent and satisfactory? And happily, we may so affirm, without any mental reservation or verbal sophistry. He, who

"hath brought life and immortality to light" has given to mankind the true definition of eternity. He who is of God, who is God; "God manifested," has also made manifest the divine environment, or the eternal realm. From His lips we hear:

"*And this is life eternal; that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent.*" At first sight the norm of Eternal Life, as framed by our Lord, seems indeed, to be no more transparent or clear, than the mysterious realm itself, which it would illuminate. The total ignoring of time, and its conditions, renders it so opaque, even under the blaze of "the light of the world." But here, as in all other instances, in which eternity is made to confront us by Him, all the tenses of grammar are transcended. For Him and the Father there is no past and no future, only the present. "Before Abraham was, I AM." Whatever inclination our minds show toward time and temporal conditions, when we cast about for some parallel to eternity, it is patent that He does not look in that direction at all, when He would confront us by it. And His formula who alone can speak "with authority" on this momentous subject, ought, of itself, to be sufficient to convince us, that there is no such Norm to be found within the whole horizon of time. Of whatever satisfactory nature it may seem to us, it must prove illusory in the end. It may hang as a Spiritual mirage before our eyes, and stimulate eternity. But as all mirages are deceptive, for the reason that all lower strata refract unequally against the higher ones, this is an illusion as well.

Our Lord, consequently, does not emphasize Eternal Life as long or short, or as barnaced by a past or a future; just as little as He conditions it by a locality, by a here or a there; or by weight or color. Whatever essentialities are embodied in the eternal economy, we are plainly taught that "time shall be no longer."

Guided, then, by "the way, the truth, and the light," we learn that "Eternal Life" Consists of *a communion with God*. "This is life eternal." What, then? "That they might know

Thee." Know Him, through whom, or how? Through "Jesus Christ, whom" He sent. "To know," in its radical sense, means *to receive, to take in, to appropriate to oneself.*" The knowledge of God through Christ is, accordingly, an indwelling of the human spirit by God's Spirit. Such an occupancy is a communion with God. Such a communion involves an intimate fellowship and right relation to God and the infinite realm of God, through the Mediator, Jesus Christ. Outside of this communion there is mere "existence," rather than real being. Only in such a communion can we be said "to live and move and have our being in God." Man is thereby elevated into the divine order of life, as mineral substance may be said to be lifted up into the vegetable plane, and the vegetable into the animal kingdom; and the latter, once more, into the human sphere.

Only in this way can we learn to see the deep meaning of our Lord's definition of "life eternal." It is Christ's sole and true formulation of "Life Eternal." All minor senses of "knowledge" will not lift the thick veil which hides eternity from the realm of time.

And yet, every idea of eternity embraces also the conception of *endlessness*, at the same time. This pervades that mysterious economy as inevitably as light and heat indwell the sun. But it is to be remembered and emphasized first of all, that the endlessness of God and of the entire divine economy, is rather a *consequence* of God's perfection and the infinite perfection of His realm, than an attribute. It is because of the infinite perfection of the Divine Being and His environment that there is "no variableness or shadow of turning." Change can only be predicated of the partial and imperfect, or what is yet immature. A perfect being as well as the perfect sphere of being, precludes all idea of variation. Hence to elevate mankind from its imperfect and varying condition into God's order of life, after being made "fit for the Kingdom of God," at once precludes all thought of change, for ever.

But, whilst endlessness is ever assumed as a result or out-

come of God and God's realm, the primary attributes of life eternal are chiefly insisted on, as positive ingredients rather, both of God and the divine sphere. In the whole Gospel, mere endlessness is made but little of in a comparative sense. That is a feature which is more assumed and taken for granted, than taught or emphasized, we may say. The endlessness of God, and of God's Kingdom of Life Eternal, is not put in the foreground. But the essential elements, or constituent ingredients, of God and God's Kingdom, are ever and loudly insisted on. Anyone may see that God's righteousness, His truth, His Holiness, His Charity, are never for a moment left to lie back or hidden. When our Lord is spoken of as "the express image of His person," or, as "being the brightness of His glory," as one in whom "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily;" as "full of grace and truth:" how little is made, comparatively, of His endlessness! Although that is ever an accompanying mark of His character and Kingdom, whenever it is put in the fore-ground, it is set down as a resultant condition, and not as a truth that is questioned and need to be argued.

And now we come to the fact, that whenever mankind would form a conception of Life Eternal, or of eternity as such, *God Himself* must be accepted as the only true *Norm*. All our images of eternity, as the perfect economy of God, must be reflected from the Being of God Himself, if they are not to prove illusory and bewildering mirages, ever and in all respects.

The mysterious principle, or Essence, which we call Life, has been given in larger and smaller measure, to the several species of His creatures. Man is the most "alive" of the myriads of living beings, we have said, The plant, though possessed of the life spark, is yet not animated *to the same degree*, as the animal is. Nor is an animal as largely endowed by it, as man is. And as the measure of the endowment, is also the measure of the environment, each species is to fill, we see at a glance, that mankind is capable of filling a larger circle, or cycle, of being than any one of the subordinate creatures. It is conceded by the most skeptical even, that the

stock of life endowment, with which man is enriched, is not and cannot be exhausted, in the temporal realm, even though a full century of years, or that of a millenium, were allotted to him. There is ever such a store remaining over of undeveloped vital forces and mental powers, in the superannuated veteran even, that it is not unscientific, in the least, to predicate a future plane of Life, which the Gospel indicates, and assures us of. Such a sphere, above and beyond the present order of existence, becomes a necessity to our minds, if man is not to stand as a riddle to himself as well as an anomaly amid the vast realm of creature-life. The fact that he is fitted for, and capable of filling a far larger environment, than time affords him, is what renders his immortality a patent truth, to be read both in his own constitution and in revelation. His eternal state is not merely a dogma of Holy Scripture, but is recorded too in his very make-up. We need not shrink from meeting the rigorous scientist on his own favorite ground, or home-field, but can boldly maintain the belief in a Life Eternal, as a truth eminently, logical and scientific too, as well as thoroughly religious. Nor can we see the least shimmer of a reason, why the idolized theory of evolution should not be thought to point the way toward such a goal. Surely, a force that is said to have held itself so steadily consistent, and upward through the ages and ages; developing on its prescribed track; breaking its path onward and forward in consequence of the law of "the survival of the fittest," until such a wonderful out-come as man is, has resulted, in the Temporal plane:—after all this long way has been so successfully trod, which may be considered the best part of the way, we do not see where the room is, for a doubt to come in, concerning an Environment, just such as the Gospel cheers him with, in which a completely perfect organism should also occupy a completely perfect sphere. *A perfect organism in a perfect environment!* And such a complementing of a perfect organism by a perfect environment is what the state of Eternal

Life is declared to be in the Gospel, according to the lucid statements of Drummond.

Why should this mystic law of "the survival of the fittest," which has survived so long, now cease to "survive," pray? If, after such adverse surrounding, in which we may suppose its germinal and primary stages to have been encompassed, it had yet not been hindered and neutralized, why should it lose its force now, when the road becomes easy and its obstacles so far less numerous? It may verily be considered a greater and harder "road to travel," from the "Protoplasm" to the present human *standium*, than the balance of the race is, even though the balance of the way constitutes the attaining of man's eternal environment. Men who claim to reverence law or force so highly, and devoutly, as to hold them as substitutes for God, should not, all at once, lose confidence in their own premises, we think. Is the scientist unscientific, at last? What, if after all, the din that Science, (so called), is raising, the truth of the Gospel should be found to be the only real science!

We hold that princely scientist, Herbert Spencer, worthy of the thanks of all Christian scholars, for the formula so scientifically framed of eternal Life. In no words is it possible to state more lucidly a "scientific" conception of what the Gospel holds up to the mind of the believer, concerning it. "Perfect correspondence would be perfect life. Were there no changes in the environment, but such as the organism had adapted changes to meet, and were it never to fail in the efficiency with which it met them, there would be eternal existence and eternal knowledge."

To him all this adaption of organism to environment is but hypothesis, or speculation; but the confession has great force, nevertheless, for all minds; and doubly so, for a devout mind, since a faith in such a perfect correspondence is thus proven to be more than a blind credence in an arbitrary declaration. It is possible, in this way, for the Christian to render a "reason for the faith that is in him."

"A perfect organism in a perfect environment" argues more than a monotonous prolongation of being, or everlastingness. The Gospel does not commit itself to an uncheering endlessness of life, at all. And it is remarkable too, that the Gospel and Science, as the latter expresses itself through the best priest of our age, should both embody a "common factor," as it were, in their several definitions of Life Eternal. It will be noted, that "knowledge" is the main element in it, according to the Gospel and Science. Professor Drummond calls attention to this fact. "This is Life Eternal, that they may know Thee, the only true God," &c. This is the teaching of Christ. "A perfect correspondence between organism and environment," would be life eternal, which Spencer calls "*eternal knowledge*."

This involves endlessness, both scripturally and logically. St. Paul teaches so much, in his confident exclamation: "For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor principalities, nor powers, nor angels, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall separate (or be able to separate) us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." It is an impregnable and invulnerable position, permanently fixed and held *in secula seculorum*.

It is, then, easy to tell what Eternal Death is. That is but the under side of Life Eternal. Both Revelation and Science agree in maintaining such a death to be a falling outside of one's proper environment. The dooming words of our Lord are very expressive: "Cast him out into outer darkness." It is the antipode of life. An eye is said to be dead, when it is no longer in right relation to light, or when that organ no longer responds to its proper surroundings. An ear is likewise dead, when it no longer answers to the element of sound. The life of any organ, or member, or of the whole body, ceases just so soon as the double process of action and reaction is disturbed or suspended. A partial or total death sets in, in this way, for the physical man. The same may be safely affirmed of the mental constitution. And when the Gospel teaches such a

condition for the spiritual organism of man, it cannot in any fair sense be said to teach an absurdity; or, a mere arbitrary dictum. If we concede God to be the true and absolute environment for man's totality, it is more than a figure of speech, when a "lost soul" is spoken of. Professor Drummond strikingly shows a stone to be "dead," though it may shape itself in a beautiful crystal, a stalagmite or stalactite, for the sole reason, that it does not react on the surroundings by which it is acted on. Just that two-fold process of "action and reaction" it is which divides the animate and inanimate spheres. In and through it, have we the characteristic of life afforded us; whilst its ceasing to play is the mark of death. When the "harvest" of action and reaction, accordingly, "is past" and "the summer" of such an activity "is gone," we may expect to see a state of death.

Such a condition of eternal life or eternal death is taught as something possible in the present stage of existence. A *post-mortem* life eternal, or death eternal, exclusively, is a platitude, which the Gospel does not contemplate; as little as the domain of science. "A future life begun in the present (a phrase, which Chaplain Maurice declares to be "astounding," like for its logic and theology) neither revelation nor reason endorses. Our Lord plainly declares, that the believer "hath" eternal life, as well as that the unbeliever "is condemned already." All the fixed standards of evangelical Churches, the ancient creeds of Christianity, and the prayers and litanies of worship, take their complexion from this Gospel doctrine, and assume eternal life to hold a knowledge and communion of God, as its essence, and as something to be obtained and realized in time, and continued and matured in eternity, since God "was, and is, and is to come."

Such a spirituality of life and death eternal, it must not be supposed, does away with the ideas of reward and punishment, in the least; unless we resolve spirituality into a mere mist or shadow. The condemnation or salvation of a soul are made to have a still more solemn signification, rather, under this

view. They are states, which involve far more than mere endlessness, inasmuch as the phrases are made to embrace positive ingredients, it will be observed. God is the Norm of such a life. And as God "is a Spirit," as well as "from everlasting to everlasting," salvation is to man what He is; whilst the absence of God is, at the same time, the want of life, or death.

Nor need we any longer look to the "beginning" or the "end," in order to define eternity; but to the centre, which is God Himself. God is "Life," "Light" and "Love," and to be brought into communion with Him, through the Mediator, Jesus Christ, is to be in God "or in the Lord," of whom it is written: "Blessed are they."

As the solar system cannot be understood, save as the sun is made to govern our views and conceptions of that vast series of worlds, so little can we hope to cherish any satisfactory and comforting hope of eternity, so far as it pertains to the Christian, except as we allow our views and conceptions to be governed by God Himself, as He has revealed Himself through Jesus Christ, the Sun of Righteousness.

VI.

THE FUTURE OF THE TEMPERANCE REFORM.

BY RICHARD J. CRADDOCK.

THE close of the first century of temperance work finds the liquor traffic richer, more powerful and arrogant, than ever before, and steadily increasing year by year. And yet there never before was so much reason for the friends of the temperance reform to feel encouraged and hopeful. The future is bright with promise. The past has been the time of the sowing of good seed, learning of needed lessons from experience and the marshalling of forces. Each generation has been educated a step in advance of the preceding one, social customs have been revolutionized and public opinion largely won over to the right side. Unless all signs fail, the near future will witness advances and victories, which until recently few dared to hope for.

Probably the most important lesson learnt from the past, and one which will probably control the temperance movement in the future, is that the work of education and reformation must be merely supplementary to efforts directed at the liquor traffic itself. The situation may be very aptly illustrated by the story of the traveler who, having made a wrong turn was going directly away from instead of towards, his destination. Meeting a boy he asked how far it was to A——. "Well, Mister," replied the boy, "if you keep on the way you are going now it is twenty-five thousand miles, but if you turn around and go the other way it is two miles and a half." Trying to persuade people to stop drinking, when two hundred thousand saloons are tempting them, is the long and exceedingly doubtful way. To come to the point at once, the intelligent and thinking peo-

ple of this country are almost unanimous in the belief that the liquor traffic is an evil which must be met promptly and effectively.

There is, however, a wide difference of opinion as to the course to be pursued. A large class believe, honestly, that the drinking habit, among a part of the community, is an inevitable evil which will always exist and which must be recognized and restricted, but can never be entirely stopped. The other class admitting the last premise argue that if the sale of liquor is degraded on a par with other crime, its consumption can be lessened to a far greater extent than under any system which includes a legal recognition of its manufacture and sale.

We propose to endeavor to impartially examine the arguments advanced in support of both theories, aided by the practical results of the trial of both, in different localities.

The principal feature of the restriction and regulation plan, is a system of high license. The first and most obvious objection is on moral grounds. It is held that the only conscientious course for an individual is a strict observance of the dividing line between right and wrong, and no countenancing of, or compromising with evil, even with the hope that good will result therefrom. Surely what is wrong in the individual is wrong in the community. Some years ago there was considerable talk of the advisability of licensing the social evil. The advocates of the scheme advanced precisely the same arguments as are now being urged in behalf of high license. Of course this infamous scheme met with no favor in religious circles, but unanimous opposition, yet now many hold that this is the only practical way to deal with a vaster evil and one which may be termed the mainstay of the evil just referred to.

Another, and, as many may think, a more practical objection, is that adopting high license as a temperance measure, is literally opening a campaign, by helping the enemy throw up fortifications.

Again, the hopes of the believers in high license are founded on the somewhat illogical supposition that many saloon-keepers

would rather give up a highly lucrative business, than to lose a small portion (comparatively) of the gains thereof, in the form of taxes.

It is claimed that high license reduces the number of saloons. Possibly so in some cases. Chicago, for instance, reports a decrease of seven hundred (if we remember rightly), in the number of licensed saloons. We have not seen any estimate of the number of unlicensed places. In some instances, in places under high license, the number even of licensed saloons has increased, and it seems reasonable to suppose that a larger number would evade, if possible, the payment of a high than a low license. But allowing (what is by no means certain or even probable), that the adoption of high license might possibly cause a decrease in the number of places where liquor is sold, it by no means follows that the amount consumed would be lessened. Increased sales in those which remained would furnish means for increased attractiveness.

As to the assertion that the worst class of saloons would be closed, the question arises—which are the worst? Which is apt to do the most harm, the wretched unattractive groggery of the slums, or the gilded and outwardly respectable palatial saloons on prominent thoroughfares, where the genteel moderate drinker feels no hesitation in entering? It is said with great show of reason, by those familiar with the inside workings of the traffic, that places whose only profit comes from the sale of liquor will be less able to stand increased taxation, than those whose places are doubly profitable through their connection with other vices.

The first year of the enforcement of the Harper law in Chicago, there was a decided increase in the arrests for drunkenness, while in New York, under low license, there was a slight decrease, during the same period. The last presentment of the grand jury of Cook county, Ill., (including Chicago), is a document, which could scarcely be used as an argument for high license.

Probably the strongest proof of the futility of taxation as a

means of restriction, is a reference to the Internal Revenue tax on distilled spirits. With a tax on the manufacture of whiskey equal to five times its cost, the per capita consumption in this country has actually increased since its imposition, notwithstanding the enormous increase in the use of malt liquors. It is a striking instance of the astonishing tenacity of the liquor traffic and its invulnerability to taxation, that at the time the tax was imposed (before which time whiskey was from 8c. to 10c. a quart) it received only a slight and temporary check, while legitimate industries, in which alcohol was largely used, were seriously embarrassed, and in some instances completely destroyed. (For instance the manufacture of burning fluid, at that time largely used for illuminating purposes.)

In Great Britain the tax on the manufacture of distilled liquors is double that imposed in this country, yet, as we know, drink is the same terrible curse there as in our own land. In Russia the manufacture and sale of distilled spirits is under the exclusive control of the government, yet we are confident that if the Imperial Government would only banish king alcohol from its dominions, far heavier shackles would be stricken from the limbs of the peasantry than at the time of the famous liberation of the Serfs.

It is claimed that the revenue derived from the liquor traffic is indispensable. This is not only a most selfish and unworthy argument, but a little examination will prove that it is the weakest of all. It is true that a very large amount is derived by the National, State and Municipal governments from this source. There is the duty on imported liquors, the tax on domestic manufacture besides licences and permits of all kinds. A very imposing array of figures no doubt, which melts away considerably, however, if the cost of collection be deducted. The balance is certainly not sufficient to meet the immense expense of the pauperism and crime directly caused by the traffic. So here is this much vaunted revenue entirely disposed of without the slightest nett benefit to the taxpayer, while a startling array of losses is yet unnoted. It is estimated that the amount

yearly expended on alcoholic stimulants in this country now reaches the sum of from eight to nine hundred million dollars. This is the first item in the loss column, beside which the amount yielded by the taxation of the traffic, sinks into utter insignificance. Now this vast sum which is thus wasted is, of course, diverted from investment and from the purchase of the necessities and luxuries of life, so that it is evident that the legitimate business of our Nation is curtailed to the same extent, involving the loss of profit to the capitalist and of wages to the working classes. The immense quantity of material used in distilling and brewing is wasted.

It is estimated that the amount lost to labor, through loss of time and incapacity caused by drinking habits, amounts to an average of at least ten per cent. of its earnings.

In the limited space of an article like this we can only indicate a few principal points which, well known and indisputable, show that the certain result of a reduction of the liquor traffic to insignificant proportions, by well administered prohibitory laws, would be greatly lessened in cost of government and largely increased material wealth upon which to levy taxation, so that its burden would be far lighter than at present.

All the arguments ever advanced in behalf of high license and other measures intended as restrictive, may, with perfect fairness, be condensed into a single sentence, "It is partial prohibition." And several formidable "ifs" stand in the way of even this comparatively small result and make it improbable, if not impossible. A noticeable effect of temporizing and half-way measures is, that they not only accomplish little if any good themselves, but they delay the day of straight-forward and effective measures. Now can we afford to lose precious years through being deluded by promises which like those of Macbeth's witches may possibly "Be kept to the ear," but are sure to be "Broken to the heart?" Canada has a license law probably as good as could be framed, one provision limiting the number of drinking places to one to every five hundred

inhabitants, yet the steady increase of the number of counties under the Scott prohibitory law, shows that prohibition is found by experience to be preferable to the best possible license system.

Having devoted thus much space to the consideration of "Restriction and Regulation," we will close by calling attention to the many liquor laws, excellent in themselves, already on the statute books, which are either practically dead letters, or enforced only through the efforts of "Law and Order Societies."

We will now pass on to the consideration of "Prohibition; its possibilities and benefits." Prohibition is simply the carrying out in a more complete and consistent form, of the principles and theories held by the advocates of restriction. The great difference between the two is that the latter throws the prestige of legal sanction around the liquor traffic and allows it to go on accumulating the means and influences, with which to fight its battles and extend its boundaries. The former knocks from under it its chief prop of legality and aims to cut off all present supplies of strength and eventually crush it out entirely. So that it may be logically asserted that the difficulties of the enforcement of prohibition would diminish year by year while restriction would have a never-ending war to wage. "Prohibition is impracticable," say the conservative. From time immemorial, everything which seemed particularly desirable and, to the eyes of common sense, perfectly feasible, has been met with this same senseless cry. Was there ever a good cause, a great truth or a needed reform against which it has not been urged? We believe that this good old world is growing better, but it would get along much faster if there were not two barriers to progress, in the shape of two classes in society, first those who from ignorance or viciousness are active opponents of good, and, second, those who would prefer to see the right side win, but who have neither faith enough to hope for final success, nor force of character and courage to take a pronounced stand according to their convictions. The

great majority of the citizens of a nation like this, at heart are hostile to vice and iniquity, and would gladly welcome a better order of things, but too many are prone to philosophize after this fashion, "It would no doubt be a very nice thing to reform the world, but then it always has been desperately wicked and probably always will be, and there really is not much use of trying to make it any better." And so a few are left to do work, which would be easy for many hands, and it is only when a good cause is carried within sight of victory that the majority of those who wish it success, can be made to believe that success is possible, and lend a helping hand.

Let us reflect on the wonderful progress being made in the world of science. Shall the moral world alone remain at a stand still? A glance back even for a single generation answers that question emphatically and shows that much has been accomplished already, and that the outlook for the future was never so hopeful.

Another objection to prohibition is that public opinion is not yet ripe for so radical a step. There is no chance of a more favorable time coming, indeed with a yearly increasing proportion of foreign born population, time is likely to add to the difficulties in the way. But if on arriving in this country emigrants found prohibition already in force, experience of its benefits and the contrast from their old home, would probably make them converts by the time they obtained the right to vote. But as it is now, bringing to our shores old country prejudice against enforced temperance and surrounded by saloon influence—obtaining the co-operation any considerable portion of them will be extremely difficult.

As to the time-worn cry that "Prohibition does not prohibit," it has been so often and so ably answered that it seems hardly necessary to recall well known arguments in answer. If it was as poorly enforced, as the majority of existing liquor laws, it would be fair to assume it a failure. The report of the Police Commissioners of San Francisco last year showed sixteen hundred unlicensed places where liquor was sold out of a

total of four thousand, one hundred. Probably this is a good deal worse than the average, but the fact remains that the license law, according to the same test applied by its critics to prohibition, is a very bad failure, and the same may be said of all the other laws relating to the traffic. Gov. Martin and other prominent officials of the State of Kansas, who certainly are qualified to judge from observation and experience, assert that the prohibitory law in that State is as well enforced as any and better than most laws. Also that, except in a few localities, not more than one tenth the liquor is now sold, that there was before the passage of the amendment, the successful operation of which, and the beneficial results of which, has converted many former opponents.

Prohibition must prove doubly effective because it attacks the liquor traffic in both front and rear. It not only outwardly represses by the strong arm of the law, but, in a great measure, it removes the causes which are its foundation. The two causes of which the liquor traffic is the effect, are, first the temptation of profit to the seller—and second—the temptation of depraved appetite to the buyer. If instead of open sale in saloons in the most prominent localities and furnished forth with all possible attractions; the sale must be carried on, if at all, in obscure corners, and stripped of its glitter of course the profit is seriously curtailed, and there would be no adequate motive to run the risk of the pecuniary loss of fines or the personal inconvenience of arrest and possible imprisonment. While to the drinker there would rarely be temptation unless they took much trouble to seek it. High license not touching either of the causes, how can it possibly cure the evil?

Another common assertion is, that prohibition may do very well for the country, but in towns and cities the liquor influence is too powerful for it to have any chance. There have recently been three very effective answers to this argument—namely, at Atlanta, Ga., at Worcester, Mass., and at Toronto, Ont. The two former cities having been carried against license by direct vote, and the latter electing a temperance candidate as mayor.

If ignorance and vice are centralized in cities—so, also, are intelligence and the power of the law. If the difficulties of enforcement are greater—the means of enforcement are greater also.

An indirect, but valuable, effect of a prohibitory liquor law would be this—hitherto the toleration of this greatest evil has blunted official and public conscience to an extent which has been very favorable to the existence and growth of other evils, nominally under the ban of the law. Prohibition would prove a wholesome tonic and purifier and would not only strike at vice in general through the downfall of its chief source, but a healthy public opinion would be reflected in increased official intolerance of evil in every form.

The steady growth of prohibition sentiment, as the subject is more widely discussed, strongly argues its merits and feasibility. The American people are a thinking people and though somewhat slow to decide on great questions, their decision is generally justified by the result.

Assuming that prohibition is the only effective cure for the evils flowing from the liquor traffic, the question now arises, how are its best results to be reached? Through non-partisan efforts, or through a political party specially pledged to secure its adoption and enforcement? We most decidedly and firmly believe through the latter means. A year ago there was nothing but resentment and ridicule expressed for the new party and its adherents. But this, we are thankful to say, is gradually giving way to a spirit of fairness and toleration, far more creditable to its opponents. People are more willing to give it a fair hearing, not entirely incredulous that much can be said in its vindication. Some very good temperance people say, "Do not degrade the cause by dragging it into politics."

A few years since, and the same feeling yet prevails in a far too great degree, the impression prevailed that a man, was in a measure, lowering himself by entering public life and accepting public office. But the truth is the man is not lowered, but politics elevated by the active interest and participation of the

intelligent and moral. And the same holds true as to issues and principles. The worse the state of the political world, the more need of the infusion of the new blood of moral reform and elevated principle.

Let us pause a moment to enquire—"What is politics?" This country of ours, with its immense territory, its boundless resources and its splendid possibilities, is as yet only the germ, of a nation, beside whose future greatness, the grandest empires of the past will sink into insignificance. That future is being moulded now. How tremendous are the interests involved. Surely the science of government is a grand and ennobling one, that should command the best thoughts and the active interest of all—from the greatest to the humblest.

Some people honestly believed that the temperance cause had received almost a death-blow from the advent of the Prohibition Party. But instead of that the year just closed has witnessed important victories, steady progress and a doubled public interest.

What are the advantages of a Prohibition Party? and what are its chances of ultimate success? In the first place a political party is a great public educator. How many people read temperance papers or attend temperance lectures? A mere handful comparatively. But by making it a political issue, it cannot escape the attention of any, and every daily paper in chronicling the news of the day, becomes a disseminator of our principles. With an intelligent population, if you can set them to thinking an important step towards victory is made. But, the question is often asked, why do not the temperance people imitate the liquor interests and transfer their support from one party to another in accordance with the favorable or unfavorable policy either adopts? The reason is very plain. It is an impossibility to do so effectively. The liquor dealer is thoroughly selfish and holds his business interests of immeasurably greater importance than such minor questions as finance, tariff, &c. The majority of the temperance voters are men of principle, indisposed to this indiscriminate action, and

consequently there cannot be the unanimity necessary to a successful pursuance of this policy. We do not mean to say that political independence is not a most important qualification of the voter, but to the conscientious voter there often seems only a choice of evils and an impossibility of espousing one good principle without antagonizing others. The natural result is a hesitation which precludes united action. The defeat of Judge Maynard, the Democratic candidate for Secretary of State in New York in 1883, and the election of the rest of that ticket is a sufficient illustration.

Kansas, Iowa and Maine are frequently cited as instances of the advantages of non-partisan prohibition, but compare the platform of the dominant party in these States with the platforms adopted in New York and other States, and it will readily be seen that although nominally under the old party name, the dominant party in the prohibition States is a prohibition party from policy if not from principle, and that it has been by the political road that so much progress has been made. It will be said, if this is the case, why cannot the same thing happen in other States and so obviate the necessity of a new political organization under a new name? Simply because in all the close and doubtful States, both of the old parties are so identified with, either opposition to prohibition or else a neutral course that they have both forfeited the confidence of the temperance element and it could never be united under either. Even if one should endorse prohibition, it would so clearly be from motives of policy as to make such indorsement comparatively valueless.

The Democratic National platform declares vigorously against sumptuary laws, an example generally followed through the Northern States, while through the South a large portion of the rank and file and many of the leaders are just as positive on the other side. The same discrepancy exists between the different wings of the Republican party. The state of affairs is contrary to all logic, it is like an attempt to mix oil and water. A breaking up of these strangely mingled elements

and their concentration under appropriate name and organization is inevitable.

About ten years ago there commenced the incipient symptoms of decay in the old parties. Dead and buried issues could no longer serve as the dividing line, and on every question of the day each party was (and remains so) divided against itself. Policy and courting popularity take the place of settled principles, and an entirely new party, with prohibition for its corner-stone, and fully committed to all other reforms which the progress of the age demands, is clearly a national necessity.

But it is said that the conditions of our political world are such that a third party is an impossibility, except temporarily. Granted, by all means. So it follows that when a new party arises on a living issue and with sufficient vitality to survive and increase, one of the old parties *must* give way to make room for it. The survival of the fittest is the inexorable law in Politics as well as in Nature.

The Greenback party movement is cited, among other instances, as a proof of the probability of failure in the present instance. As finance has always been recognized as an important problem by all parties, and both parties have given great and willing attention to it, there was really no room for a distinctive party on that issue. And we say this with no desire of belittling the importance of the greenback theory or of venturing an opinion as to its merits.

The resumption and successful continuation of specie payments with the gradual recovery from the depression of the years, following the panic of 1873, were other causes, which sufficiently account for the decadence of that third party. So that there is not the slightest parallel between it and the Prohibition Party, indeed, so exact is the contrast that it indirectly argues success for the latter.

Prohibition has been compared to Abolition as parallel cases of moral reform. This has called forth the assertion that Emancipation was an accident or rather necessity of war, and not at all the result of political or other agitation. Supposing

that the war had never taken place, it still seems impossible to imagine how slavery could have continued to exist much longer than it did, although, possibly Emancipation might have been gradual, instead of instant. The rapid increase of population in the North and West, and their consequent, constantly increasing political preponderance, alone would have been sufficient to doom slavery. The South to-day owes a considerable portion of its political importance to the increased representation secured through negro suffrage. Can any one believe that slavery could have continued to exist to this day, in this country—when nations far behind us in point of progress have, or are voluntarily abolishing it?

There has been an attempt to belittle and ridicule the new party movement on account of its necessarily small numerical beginning. The presidential campaign of 1884 was one of the most (if not the most) exciting and hotly contested campaigns, the country has ever witnessed. The chances of the old parties seemed nearly evenly balanced, and every vote possessed an unusual value. That, in the face of these circumstances, and without, of course, the remotest chance of success at the time, 150,000 citizens cast their votes for a principle, is remarkable enough to argue strongly and well for the future.

In the States holding elections during 1885, fourteen in number (if we remember rightly), the prohibition party vote was fully as large as in the entire country the year before, Ohio increasing her vote from 11,000 to 28,000, and New York from 25,000 to 31,000. This, in the face of a largely diminished total vote (and the stay-at-home vote is almost entirely made up of the better element), furnished the best reasons for prophesying a decided and rapid setting of the tide toward the new party.

The vote in favor of constitutional prohibition in Ohio (323,000) has been contrasted with the new party vote, as a proof that non-partisan effort is that much stronger. Now, we ask, in the name of fairness and common sense, which counted for the most,—the 323,000 votes which accomplished nothing,

or the 11,000 St. John voters, increased last year to 28,000, laying the foundation for (as we believe) a grand future? Indeed, the well-known history of that Ohio campaign is a strong argument of the necessity for a prohibition party.

There has also been much talk about throwing one's vote away. A little thought will show that one vote counts for far more at the first small beginning of a righteous movement than after it has gained strength and impetus.

Such a vote is no more thrown away than is money deposited in a savings bank for future use. It may be likened to the snowball rolling down the mountain-side, sure to grow and increase until it becomes irresistible. Besides, what kind of a fidelity to principle is that which stops to inquire whether it is likely to win, before lending support?

It would be more consistent to call a vote thrown away which is cast for a party which opposes or fails to support the principles we hold dear. Yes, worse than thrown away.

Let us inquire into the reasons of the intelligent voter for attachment to the party with which he is identified. It has a noble record, it holds an honored place in our nation's history—it (in his opinion) has best met the needs of the nation in the past. In short, his patriotism and interest in the material and moral welfare of the nation has governed his political action and held him to that party which embodied the principles which his own reason endorsed. What is the present position of the temperance voter, when all the reasons which have held him to party in the past, fall to the ground in the light of this new issue? When his own convictions and his party's course widely diverge? Which shall be given up? Continued adherence to a party which no longer represents our convictions, is like clinging to a body from which the soul has fled. Must everything be sacrificed to an idolatrous attachment to empty names and a dead and gone past? Our guiding star should be that sincere and intelligent love of country which is reflected on that party nearest to its present need.

Although the fact has been frequently alluded to of late, it

seems to be generally forgotten that many of the States, at one time, passed prohibitory laws, and afterwards repealed them and returned to license,—notably, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island and Michigan. Was prohibition a failure in these States? By no means. The laws were either still-born or so lacking in vitality that their repeal was easily accomplished, and this clearly because of the want of an organized support back of them. Public sentiment may be termed the blade of the sword; organization is the handle which makes it effective. There is some reason to fear that a like outcome is not impossible in one of the States now under prohibition.

In a State like Maine, where nearly everybody is a prohibitionist, the law may, perhaps, be satisfactorily enforced, simply through public sentiment; but, where there is a numerous and powerful opposition, there is only one way, and that is the political control by the majority of the judicial power.

It has been asked, if a prohibition party would not be a perpetual necessity for the enforcement of the law? By no means. After a generation or less of real prohibition, it would be so firmly established in popular favor that serious opposition would be impossible. After an experience of its benefits it would be so identified with the public interest, that a party in its support would be as superfluous as a candle at noonday. The issue would be settled as is slavery, and the field left clear for new ones. But it must be first launched and firmly established, and not left a thing of chance and uncertainty.

A new party founded on a great moral reform must prove beneficial in many ways, besides on the one question of prohibition. It would naturally absorb and be composed of the best elements of both of the old parties, both leaders and rank and file, whose good tendencies and power for good are so seriously hampered by their present associations. At present, the old parties, though there is no strict division on principles, are, unfortunately, sectionally divided, a division which, although deplored by all, is likely to continue under the present order of things. The new party presents an issue which will obliterate

sectionalism from politics, and truly unite North, South, East and West.

There would be a far better chance for civil service and other reforms, with a young, vigorous and progressive new party, than they can possibly have with the old parties. One of the most important questions of to-day is the labor question. The immediate pecuniary loss and the debasing and irritating effects of the liquor traffic fall with peculiar weight on the laboring classes, and even a partial removal of its evils would be a long step toward a peaceful and satisfactory solution of this great problem. The late contest in Atlanta, Ga., furnished a remarkable spectacle of fraternal mingling of black and white, and is a suggestion of a permanent obliteration of the color line in politics through this new party.

The temperance cause has, at present, three great elements of strength of recent growth. We refer, first, to that splendid and invaluable organization, "The Women's Christian Temperance Union," which is doing so much all over the country. Secondly, all religious denominations, Protestant and Catholic, are yearly growing more pronounced and practical in their opposition to that greatest scourge of evil—the liquor traffic. Thirdly. The rapid awakening of the working classes to the truth that the liquor traffic is the greatest barrier to the elevation of labor.

With so much in our favor, there is surely every reason to feel encouraged and hope for great and splendid results, if there is faithful and untiring labor.

We look over the length and breadth of our land and see an outraged nation summoning the liquor traffic to the bar of judgment to answer for our wasted resources, for the destruction of husbands, brothers and sons, (yes, and wives and daughters, too,) for a rank harvest of poverty and crime, perverted talents, broken hearts and blighted homes; but its only answer is to flaunt in our faces the license, duly signed and paid, and triumphantly, cry, like Shylock, "It is so nominated in the bond."

This, then, is our view of the work that lies before us. The rending of this unrighteous bond of license, the stripping from the traffic of its armor of legality, the building up of a political party through which to secure and enforce Constitutional Prohibition, State and National. (The Republican National Platform, in 1872, said, in substance, that the late Constitutional Amendments, the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth—would be valueless unless enforced by the party which secured them). Then hopeful work (the scourge of corruption being cut off) for the education of the masses to a willing obedience to and co-operation with the laws. There should be no dissensions, and nothing but kindly feeling between temperance workers, no matter how much they may differ as to methods. Any conscientious effort in any branch of the work—reformatory, educational, non-partisan or political, must aid in the ultimate accomplishment of the ends mentioned above.

Of course, this subject is too vast a one to be treated of in an article like this, save very incompletely and with a few fragmentary thoughts and facts, but we have endeavored to write fairly and without prejudice, with the hope of attracting thought to the subject. In conclusion, the temperance army could have no better guide and motto than those grand words of Abraham Lincoln, "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us finish the work we are in."

VII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

AN ARAMAIC METHOD. *A Class Book for the Study of the Elements of Aramaic from Bible and Targums*, by Charles R. Brown. Part I. *Text, Notes and Vocabulary*. Part II. *Elements of Grammar*. Chicago: American Publication Society of Hebrew, Morgan Park. 1884 and 1886.

It is gratifying to see that the Theological Seminaries in this country are gradually enlarging their curriculum of study, so as to embrace other Semitic languages besides the Hebrew. Among these the Aramaic, or so-called Chaldee, will always hold an important place. For, apart from the fact that it throws much light on the Hebrew, which can only be fully understood when studied comparatively, it is the language in which large sections of the books of Ezra and Daniel are written. Accordingly, a knowledge of it is indispensable to the Biblical scholar who would read the whole of the Old Testament in the original text. Moreover, it is the language of the Targums, the oldest of which—Onkelos on the Pentateuch and Jonathan on the Prophets—are, in a critical and exegetical point of view, among our best ancient helps. Such being its importance, it is a sign of a healthy and vigorous life that the Aramaic is receiving an ever wider and closer attention. In our own Seminary at Lancaster, the study of this language is as binding as that of the Hebrew, and the day is not far distant when this will be the case in all theological schools.

There has been a felt need, however, of a suitable text-book with correct philological principles and a right method of teaching. The older grammars by Winer & Riggs are antiquated. Petermann's *Lingua Chaldaica*, besides being too brief, is written in Latin, and is thus unavailable as a manual for those who have not a familiar acquaintance with that language. Prof. Brown in his *Aramaic Method* has attempted to supply the existing want, and his attempt is highly successful.

The work consists of two parts in separate volumes. Part First, issued in 1884, comprises a new Chrestomathy, with Notes, and Vocabulary. To those who have mastered the elements of Hebrew the arrangement of the text will prove very helpful; for the first ten chapters of Genesis are given in the Hebrew (Baer's edition) on the left page, with the corresponding portions of the Targum of

Onkelos on the right page. This is an excellent feature, as it enables the student by comparison to see the close affinity between the Hebrew and the Aramaic, and at the same time to trace out the laws of divergence, both lexical and grammatical. The Aramaic comprises several dialects, which it is important to hold apart and study in right order. "The Targum of Onkelos" says the author in his preface to Part I, "being the purest Aramaic and at the same time, a nearly literal translation of the Pentateuch, seems best fitted for the acquisition of the principles; after this, the Biblical Aramaic may be studied intelligently, and its Hebraisms noted; and, lastly, the later and more corrupt Targums may be read with advantage." This correct idea governs the arrangement of the Chrestomathy. *First*, we have on parallel pages Gen. i—x from the Targum of Onkelos with the Hebrew text; *secondly*, a note of references to the Biblical Aramaic, but without the text, for which the student is referred to his Hebrew Bible; *thirdly*, Gen. viii from the Targum of Pseudo Jonathan, which should be studied in connection with the corresponding chapter in Onkelos, in order to observe how the earlier and purer dialect differs from the later and more corrupt; *fourthly*, Josh. xx and Is. vi from the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel; *fifthly*, Ps. xxiv and Ps. cl from the Targum on the Psalms; and, lastly, Ruth ii from the Targum on the Megilloth. These selections are judiciously made and are well fitted to illustrate the peculiar characteristics of the several Targums. The text followed is that of Walton's Polyglot with the most necessary corrections; the notes, which should perhaps be more numerous, especially on points of grammar, are of a textual grammatical and hermeneutical character, and the vocabulary, based on Buxtorf and Levy, gives brief definitions of all the words found in the Chrestomathy.

Part Second, comprising the elements of Aramaic grammar, has just been issued. Unfortunately we have not time before going to press to make a close examination; but such a brief glance as we have been able to give it has impressed us very favorably. The method is inductive, like that of Harper's Hebrew text-books, which we noticed in the January number. Indeed Brown's *Aramaic Method* and Harper's *Elements of Hebrew* run parallel, the one serving to illustrate the other. The author, *first*, under each topic, gives the several facts drawn either from the Targums or the Aramaic of the Old Testament; then, *secondly*, he deduces the principles which these facts illustrate and by which they are governed. This is the normal way of teaching a language, because by it the student, under the guidance of his teacher, works out the grammar for himself. Another feature which gives value to this work is, that the author carefully distinguishes the various Aramaic dialects from each other and from the cognate Hebrew. "The present issue," he says in the Preface to the Second Part, "is an attempt to open the

way toward a statement of the facts connected with one great branch of this tongue, and the different dialects are here treated comparatively. At the same time the purest type of Aramaic, as it appears in Onkelos, has served as the model, only Biblical variations being *emphasized*, those in the other Targums not belonging to an elementary stage of the study, and, indeed, not being before us in as satisfactory a form as could be wished. Comparison by the student is facilitated by the fact that only principles common to all the dialects, or appearing in Onkelos, are given in usual type, while all exceptional usage is described in special type."

Should there be a second edition, these two small volumes should, for convenience' sake, be combined into one. At the same time, greater clearness should be given to some of the details. For instance, the numbering and lettering should be found both in the text or in the examples. This is not always the case. Thus, on p. 33, L, we find in the examples, 1, *a*, *b*; but in the text *a* and *b* are not indicated. Again, on the same page, under the heading VOWELS, we find *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, in the text, but not in the examples which illustrate the text. This may prove a source of confusion to the beginner. Would it not be well, also, where a comparison is made between the Hebrew and the Aramaic, to give, oftener than is actually done, the Hebrew word corresponding to the Aramaic? Thus, on p. 33, אַרְרָן = Hebrew אֶרְרָן, exchange of ' and ׀; and so in all the other examples. Some of the notes, too, in Part First need to be carefully revised. For instance, p. 56, אַרְרָן, the author says, is "a peculiar Pael form in which ' takes the place of daghesh in the second radical;" yet, in Part Second, p. 39, he quotes this very instance as illustrating the weakness of the letter ׀. The fact is, אַרְרָן is the Shaphel of אַרְרָן, the Hebrew root, instead of the regular Aramaic אַרְרָן (see Levy's *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, Zweiter Band, p. 476, col. 1).

These are slight blemishes which can easily be removed and which in no way disturb the general excellence of the work. Prof. Brown deserves the thanks of all the friends of Semitic learning for furnishing them with a valuable manual.

GOD'S REVELATIONS OF HIMSELF TO MEN, As successively made in the Patriarchal, Jewish and Christian Dispensations, and in the Messianic Kingdom. By Samuel J. Andrews, author of "The Life of our Lord upon Earth." New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1886. Price, \$2.50.

This volume treats of the revelations which God has successively made of Himself, in history and prophecy, as these are contained in the Sacred Scriptures. It makes no claim whatever to being critical after the modern fashion. The author accepts the Bible as

a true record of God's purpose in His incarnate Son and of the divine actings to fulfill that purpose. His aim in this treatise "is simply to set forth that record in its order, and to restore to it that unity in Christ which it claims upon its face, and which was ascribed to it by our Lord, but which with many of its readers it has lost." That the Bible should be held in its right relation to the Living Christ he considers to be at this time a matter of the very highest importance. "Christ," he maintains, "working from heaven through His Church, is the proof that He is risen, and invested with all power and dominion. Accurate Hebrew and Greek scholarship is desirable in those who can attain to it, but it is only instrumental. Of far more importance is it to be so cleansed and illumined, that we have spiritual discernment of the purpose of God, and such faith in His words, and such spirit of self-sacrifice, that we give ourselves to be co-workers with Him, and with His Son. The one thing, and the only thing, that will enable the church to overcome the growing infidelity of the time is to trust in her Living Head and obey Him, as He trusted in and obeyed the Father. Then will Christ be His own witness from heaven: He will testify to Himself."

The book opens with a brief introduction giving a general statement of principles. It is then divided into three parts, which treat respectively of "The Revelations of God to men before and under the Theocracy;" "The Revelations of God to men in the Christian Church;" and, "The Revelations of God to men in the Messianic Kingdom." The first part, which makes up by far the greater portion of the contents of the volume, is principally of a historical character, and shows how revelation became fuller and fuller as men were prepared to receive it. The remaining parts set forth the revelations which men now sustain to God and to Christ in His church, and which they will sustain when the Messianic Kingdom is once fully established on earth. The conclusion consists of some pertinent remarks on Christianity and other religions. The work is written in a lucid and forcible style, is throughout scholarly and theologically sound, and will amply repay careful study. It possesses the same excellent qualities that have caused its author's book on "The Life of Our Lord upon Earth" to be so widely recognized as a standard authority.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By Henry C. Sheldon, Professor of Historical Theology in Boston University. In two volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1886. Price, \$3.50.

Christianity has to do with the highest interests of humanity, and hence its teachings must ever be of paramount importance. The truths which pertain to it are unchangeable and eternal, but the apprehension of these truths is progressive. On this account the

doctrines or teachings relating to them are subject to more or less change accordingly as the truths themselves are more clearly perceived and more fully understood; as is also the case with the teachings of the sciences that have to do with the material universe. A knowledge of the changes that consequently occur in the presentations of truth is always desirable on the part of all who would keep themselves properly informed. Such knowledge these volumes furnish, in a clear, concise, accurate and impartial manner, with respect to Christian doctrine from the close of the Apostolic age to the present time. They are accordingly a truly valuable contribution to theological science.

The matter which is presented in these volumes is admirably arranged for the purpose of study and reference. The entire history is divided into five periods, which may be properly designated, by their distinguishing but not exclusive characteristics, as the Age of Apology, the Age of Polemics, the Age of Scholasticism, the Age of Confessions and the Age of Strife and Attempted Reconciliation. The *first* of these extends from the close of the Apostolic Age to A. D. 320; the *second*, from A. D. 320 to 726; the *third*, from A. D. 726 to 1517; the *fourth*, from A. D. 1517 to 1720, and the *fifth*, from A. D. 1720 to the present time. The doctrines of each of these periods are arranged and considered under six different heads, to each of which is assigned a chapter. The headings of these chapters are,—Factors in the Doctrinal Development of the Period; the Godhead; Creation and Creatures; Redeemer and Redemption; the Church and the Sacraments; and Eschatology. Each period is also prefaced by a brief introduction. The treatment of all parts of the history is scholarly, and, though concise, yet anything but dull and unsatisfactory.

The work we consider especially well adapted to supply the wants of theological students, intelligent laymen, and the great body of ministers who have not the means to purchase or the time to study more elaborate and technical works on the subject of which it treats. Even those who have the larger works will still find this of service. It will prove a valuable acquisition to any library.

CURRENT DISCUSSIONS IN THEOLOGY. By the Professors of Chicago Theological Seminary. Vol. III. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell, 1885. Price, \$1.50.

We would heartily commend this book to ministers and others who would keep themselves well informed as to what is doing in the theological world. It supplies a want which is not supplied, so far as we know, by any other work published in this country. Its aim is "to answer the question which every student of theological and ecclesiastical subjects may well be supposed to ask at the close of each year, viz.: What has been done in the differ-

ent fields of sacred learning during the past twelve months, and what are the latest results of such studies?" It is, in short, an annual review of the principal works which have appeared in the various departments of theological science and of the impressions made by their publication. The first volume, which was published in 1883, was good, but each succeeding volume has been an improvement on the one immediately preceding it. Hereafter the work will be published regularly in October of each year.

The volume before us contains six papers, treating of subjects pertaining to as many different departments of theology. Prof. Curtis reviews the present state of Old Testament studies, and Prof. Hyde that of New Testament study. Prof. Scott writes about the most recent studies in church history, and notices some of their most important results. Prof. Boardman calls attention to the latest works on Christian Dogmatics, Apologetics and Morals, and gives a more or less critical account of them. Prof. Fisk aims to give an impartial and just estimate of the value of the principal works on Homiletics that have appeared in Great Britain and America since the last volume of *Current Discussions in Theology* went to press; while Prof. Willcox treats of the Pastor, Pastoral Theology of the New Testament, private life of the Pastor, work in the study, public worship, revivals of religion, pastoral visiting and kindred subjects. All the papers have been prepared with great care, contain a large amount of important information and are unusually readable. Here and there a slight error has crept into the book, but we have found no very serious one. A good table of contents and a copious index form part of the merits of the book, and add to its usefulness.

THE MOSAIC ORIGIN OF THE PENTATEUCHAL CODES. By Geerhardus Vos., Fellow of Princeton Theological Seminary. With an introduction by Professor William Henry Green. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Co., 714 Broadway, 1886. Price, \$1.50.

This treatise was prepared as a thesis in competition for the Hebrew fellowship in Princeton Theological Seminary, which was awarded to the author. The question discussed in it is one of great importance, and that about which the critical battle at present is especially raging. The author shows himself well acquainted with the whole field of controversy, and presents the arguments of both sides with clearness and marked ability. Moreover, his treatment of the question at issue is characterized throughout by candor and fairness to all parties. Of the various books on the Pentateuchal question recently published, we know of none that will be likely to prove more satisfactory than this, to those who have not the time or ability to master the more elaborate and extensive works on the subject, and who, nevertheless, wish to gain a general knowledge of the present state of the critical controversy concerning the Pentateuch in all its bearings.

ATONEMENT AND LAW ; or, Redemption in Harmony with Law as Revealed in Nature. By John M. Armour. Second edition. Philadelphia : The Christian Statesman Publishing Co., 1520 Chestnut Street; H. B. Garner, successor to Smith, English & Co., 710 Arch Street. Price, \$1.50.

The importance of the Atonement made by Christ for the sins of the world it would be impossible to over-estimate. On it the hope of humanity depends. Apart from it, there can be no salvation or true blessedness for men. It is not surprising, therefore, that believers in its truth should in all ages feel a deep interest in setting forth its character and defending it against the assaults of unbelief. This is the purpose of the work whose title is given above. In it some good points are made ; but, as a whole, it cannot be said to add much to our knowledge of the subject, or even to be a strong defence of the doctrine of which it treats.

The book opens with an introductory chapter, the object of which is to show that "the work of Redemption, as well as the course of nature, proceeds in accordance with a pre-determined plan, and under absolute and invariable law—law quite as exact as that which governs the material universe." The work is then divided into two parts. The first part is devoted to a consideration, in four chapters, of Law, Moral and Natural. Chapter first treats in a fresh and vigorous manner of motion, force and life, and aims to prove that "all the motion that man has ever been able to trace to its source he has found to proceed from life." Chapter second, also in a fresh and vigorous manner, deals with "the Latest Idol, 'the nature of things.'" The author here calls attention to some very important truths too frequently lost sight of. Chapters third and fourth discuss the nature of Moral Law and Will. Both these chapters we consider weak. The treatment of neither subject is at all satisfactory. The position is taken that moral law is the will of God in commandment, and that it cannot be implanted within, but must be made known unto moral beings; but how under such circumstances there can be any knowledge of moral law, it is not even attempted to indicate, much less to demonstrate. Part Second, which consists of five chapters, relates directly to the Atonement. The first two chapters of this part are designed to prove that there can be no salvation without atonement, and that no atonement can be made by the violator of law. In chapters third and fourth there is an effort made to show that substitution is normal in law and obedience to law. The law to which the author appeals in proof of this is human law. And herein we think the weakness of his argument consists. The very title of the book, on this account, it strikes us, is in some sense a misnomer. By "Law as revealed in nature" it is natural to understand the laws of the physical universe. These are admitted by all to be invariable and infallible, as being the laws of the Creator; but such is not the case as regards human enactments, and hence an appeal to them is not in

itself a conclusive proof of eternal right. Chapter fifth, which closes the volume, treats of Intervention, and is much more satisfactory. What is said in it is deserving of serious consideration.

That the doctrine of the Atonement, as generally presented, does not meet the demands of the present age, we think is not to be denied; but, as yet, no one has appeared possessed of the genius requisite to reconstruct the doctrine satisfactorily. When the proper time comes, however, we doubt not such a person will be forthcoming.

THE COMING OF THE LORD. By Rev. John C. Rankin, D.D. Funk & Wagnalls: New York, 10 and 12 Dey Street; London: 44 Fleet Street. 1885. Price, 75 cents.

In this small volume, the substance of which appeared first in the "*Southern Presbyterian Review*," for October, 1884, Dr. Rankin gives what he conceives to be the clear teaching of the New Testament touching the Second Coming of Christ. The view which he maintains is that the Messianic kingdom was established on earth soon after the ascension of Christ, and that He will not come again in person until the end of the world. His theory is that, "whatever triumph the Gospel is to have, and whatever repression of Satan is to take place for its success, are to be realized under the present dispensation." The premillennial theory, he holds, leads its advocates into "tangled errors." The book is well written and its arguments are presented in a clear and forcible manner. There is nothing specially new, however, in its pages, and those who entertain a different view will not be likely to be convinced that they are in error by its objections to their interpretation of the Scripture teaching concerning the subject under consideration.

SAINT AUGUSTIN, MELANCHTHON, NEANDER. Three Biographies. By Philip Schaff. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, publishers, 10 and 12 Dey Street. Price, \$1.00.

The greater part of this volume is taken up by the biographical sketch of Saint Augustin, which is an enlarged revision of the author's *St. Augustin*, which was published in German in 1854 and translated into English by Professor Thomas C. Porter, D.D. To this is now added a Sketch of Melanchthon and Reminiscences of Neander, which add considerably to the interest of the volume. The reminiscences of Neander are not only valuable, but unusually entertaining. The book throughout is written in a popular and attractive style and is especially adapted to young men and students. It is also an admirable work for the Sunday-school library. The name of its author is a sufficient guarantee of its excellence.

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE. Discourses upon Holy Scripture. By Joseph Parker, D.D., Minister of the City Temple, Holborn Viaduct, London. Author of "*Ecce Deus*," "*The Paraclete*," "*The Priesthood of Christ*,"

"Springdale Abbey," "The Inner Life of Christ," "Ad Clerum," "The Ark of God," "Apostolic Life," "Tyne Chylde," etc. Vol. II. The Book of Exodus. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey Street. Price, \$1.50.

The general characteristics of this volume are the same as those of the volume on Genesis noticed in the January number of this Review. The contents consist of general notes on the Book of Exodus, thirty-nine short discourses on various passages of the book taken in order, together with occasional notes and "Handfuls of Purpose." The latter are homiletic hints in the form of brief sketches containing pointed reflections on twenty-six different passages of Scripture also taken from the Book of Exodus. Like those on Genesis, all the discourses abound in brilliant and instructive thoughts, and, as a whole, are designed to aid the reader in gathering the divine lessons which the book on which they are based was written to teach men.

THE FINAL SCIENCE; OR, SPIRITUAL MATERIALISM. Funk & Wagnalls: New York, 10 and 12 Dey Street. 1885. Price, 75 cents.

A neat little volume of nearly two hundred pages, by an anonymous author. We read some distance into this book before we discovered that it was a satire on materialism. It may be called irony, caricature or burlesque, though the last term is usually limited to gesture. It is composed of nine chapters, as follows: 1, The Crisis in Materialism; 2, First Principles; 3, Matter; 4, Atoms; 5, Evolution; 6, Deiga; 7, Man; 8, Morality; 9, Religion. There is throughout a *reductio ad absurdum*. It has, moreover, a genial spirit and rises in some passages into genuine humor. "Mr. Spencer's method proceeds from the unknowable to the knowable, and evolves the latter from the former. He defines the process as follows: '*Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity, and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation.*'" (First Principles.) This evolution is perfectly intelligible; it is, according to Mr. Spencer, the only thing we can understand. It is the Known which is evolved from the Unknowable. . . . The old, vulgar method defines the obscure by means of the clear; the modern, profound method defines the obscure by means of the more obscure. That's science."

Irony is a keen weapon and requires skillful handling, else the one who handles it will be sure to cut himself. Then, it is no easy task to keep up such a style throughout a whole book. So far as the author of this book succeeds, it is because he shows a good acquaintance with the best writers on materialism, and we can recommend it to all who may be seeking for weapons to use against the error of this class of writers. What can stand against

ridicule? Cervantes broke down, demolished chivalry by his *Don Quixote*. Ridicule may become a very unfair method of fighting an antagonist, and, when it is malignant, it is not only unfair, but immoral. This writer, as we have said, exhibits a kind, not a malignant spirit, and, so far, his work has the character of true art. It is a specimen of the comic, under the class of wit and humor. With some readers it will accomplish more than a positive argument, and with some, also, it keeps up the interest better than a different treatment might do. Scientists of the agnostic school have been pretty free in pouring ridicule upon all faith in supernatural revelation, or, if not ridicule, contempt. It is but fair to turn the tables upon them. The work is, at least, scholarly. The writer is not a sciolist. We leave it to the reader to judge of the success of the argument. It is, at least, entertaining and of a charitable spirit.

THIRTY THOUSAND THOUGHTS, being Extracts Covering a Comprehensive Circle of Religious and Allied Topics, etc., etc. Edited by the Rev. Canon H. D. M. Spence, M.A., Rev. Joseph S. Exell, M.A., Rev. Charles Neil, M.A. Vol. IV. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 10 and 12 Dey Street. 1885.

This work grows upon us. We were not much drawn to it at first. The title did not impress us favorably. Thirty thousand seemed too large a number for real, genuine thoughts, and too few for all the possible notions that may pass through the brain. But the work is a real encyclopedia, a thesaurus of the thoughts of the greatest thinkers the world has produced. The present volume comprises what may be regarded as the dogmatic sections of the work. In accordance with a suggested arrangement, the main dogmatic section is divided into three divisions, viz.: 1st, The Normal Relations between God and Man; 2d, Their Breach; and 3d, Their Restoration. It was considered best to have a somewhat lengthy introduction, in which will be found much matter of a useful kind, not to be obtained without the possession of a large library and diligent search. A list of the contents of this volume will indicate the nature of the topics treated. 1st, Jehovistic Names and Titles of God; 2d, The Attributes of God; 3d, Sins; 4th, Christian Dogmatics. Part 1st, Introduction; 2d, The Normal Relation between God and Man; 3d, The Breach of the Normal Relation between God and Man, 4th, The Restoration, etc. Under the names and titles of God we have, Jehovah, Jehovah-Elyon, Jehovah-Jireh, Jehovah-Mekadeshcen, Jehovah-Nissi, Jehovah-Robi, Jehovah-Ropheca, Jehovah-Shalom, Jehovah-Shammah, Jehovah-Tsebahoth and Jehovah-Tsidkenu. This is only introductory to the main portion of the volume. Of course, we do not find here a scientific dogmatik, but we presume that even theologians would be glad to have before them the best sayings of

the greatest men in their profession on the various topics named; and ordinary readers will find here what they could not otherwise find without going through a theological library. Herein consists the special value of this great work; it brings together what it would require a great deal of search and research to find. Ministers who may not have access to many different authors have the best thoughts of those authors brought here together in a comparatively small compass, and they have selected for them just what they wish to know a certain author says on a given topic. Laymen who read will also here find great help; and in the case of both ministers and laymen a many-sided view like that here presented is calculated to give breadth to their thinking. Altogether we can heartily commend this work as one that will add to the real worth of any well-selected library. It will be completed in seven royal 8vo. vols. Vols. I.-IV. are now ready. The remaining three volumes will be issued at the rate of one every three months. The price of the volumes, when published, will be \$3.50 each. To advance subscribers, whose subscription for the "*Homiletic Review*" is paid up for 1886, at \$2.50 each.

COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF JOHN, with an Historical and Critical Introduction. By F. Godet, Doctor in Theology and Professor in the Faculty of the Independent Church of Neuchatel. Vol. I. Translated from the Third French Edition, with a Preface, Introductory Suggestions and Additional Notes, by Timothy Dwight, Professor of Sacred Literature in Yale College. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 10 and 12 Dey Street. 1886. Price, \$3.00.

Prof. Dwight has not merely translated this excellent commentary on the Gospel of St. John, but he has added to it many valuable contributions. Over fifty pages are added to the work on the internal evidences, besides many able critical notes scattered through the volume.

It is scarcely necessary to speak of the merits of the original of which this is a translation. Godet stands among the first exegetes of this age. This work on St. John's Gospel is a masterpiece. It is the result of twenty years' study. The first edition was published in 1864-65. This has been so modified and improved that it is really a new work. And what makes it especially valuable for the student is the masterly introduction, which occupies about half of this first volume, or over 250 pages, besides the 50 pages of the American editor. The actual commentary reaches through only the first *five* chapters of the Gospel. The next volume is expected to be ready by July.

Any one who has not yet selected a commentary on the Gospel of St. John would not go wrong, we think, in selecting this work, and if he already has that of Meyer or Lange, he will still be repaid in securing this.

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW. A Monthly Magazine of Religious Thought, Sermonic Literature and Discussion of Practical Issues. I. K. Funk, D.D., Rev. J. M. Sherwood, Editors. Publishers, Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey Street. 1886.

This magazine is published in New York, Toronto and London, and circulates in the United States, Canada and England. It may be said of it, we think, that it has won the first place in the field it occupies, and is likely to hold this front rank. Every year adds to its interest. It is more and more becoming a necessity for clergymen who wish to keep up with the most advanced methods of ministerial work. Its list of contributors contains the names of many of the most eminent preachers and pastors in the country.

THE CO-OPERATIVE INDEX TO PERIODICALS. Issued Quarterly. Edited by W. I. Fletcher, with the co-operation of members of the American Library Association. Vol. II., No. 1, January-March, 1886. New York: Publication Office, 31 and 32 Park Row. London: Trübner & Co., 57 and 59 Ludgate Hill. Yearly subscription, \$2.00. Single numbers, 50 cents.

Those who would know what subjects are treated of in the leading periodicals of this country, and of Great Britain, will find this a very valuable publication. It is a quarterly index to about one hundred different periodicals.

A POPULAR TREATISE ON BAPTISM, in Three Parts: *What is Baptism? Who is to be Baptized? How are we to be Baptized?* By Rev. J. J. Leberman, D.D. Dayton, Ohio: Reformed Publishing Company. 1886.

An interesting little manual of 153 pages, written in popular style, as its title indicates, and containing much valuable information for church members, especially parents. It has come into our hands too late for extended notice at this time, but we can give it our hearty commendation.